

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 753

EC 182 357

TITLE Special Education Council Mainstreaming Study, 1984.

INSTITUTION Saint Paul Public Schools, Minn.

PUB DATE Nov 84

NOTE 88p.; Report of the "Task Force on Mainstreaming" to the Special Education Council. A tutorial based on this document entitled "Mainstreaming: How It Is Viewed by Teachers, Administrators, and Parents" was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children (64th, New Orleans, LA, March 31-April 4, 1986). Appendix is barely legible.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education; *Mainstreaming; *Parent Attitudes; Success; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Role

IDENTIFIERS *Minnesota (Saint Paul)

ABSTRACT

The task force report describes development and results of a questionnaire on mainstreaming completed by 122 parents of special education students and 458 regular and special education teachers, administrators, and support staff. Findings include the following: special education staff are seen as the most interested, knowledgeable, and supportive of mainstreaming although implementation responsibility of mainstreaming falls on regular educators; class size and teacher workloads are of great concern; regular educators are more concerned with the effects of mainstreaming on regular education students and consider the teacher's attitude less important to the special student's success; and special educators are more concerned about mainstreaming effects on the special education student and generally view the teacher's attitude as critical to student success. Recommendations are offered regarding student count, staffing patterns and needs, inservice education needs, and suggested strategies for improving communication, attitudes, and competencies. An appendix supplies responses to a question on concerns about mainstreaming. (CL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED268753

SPECIAL EDUCATION COUNCIL

MAINSTREAMING STUDY

1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David
Bennett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



SAINT PAUL PUBLIC SCHOOLS

INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT 625

EC 182 357

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Daniel B. Bostrom
Chair

Margo Fox
Vice Chair

George F. Janisch
Clerk

James S. Griffin
Treasurer

William Magnuson
Member

Al Oertwig
Member

Eleanor E. Weber
Member

ADMINISTRATION

Dr. David Bennett
Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Erma E. McGuire
Assistant Superintendent of
Curriculum & Instruction

Charles M. Hagen
Director of Special Education
Curriculum & Instruction

Oliver Courtemanche
Assistant to the Superintendent for
Administrative and Support Services

Ramon Firnstahl
Director Elementary Education

Dr. David Frye
Director Secondary Education

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Anita Ratwik, Chair - Parent

Bernard R. Dailey, Assistant Director Special
Education

Ann De Gree, Principal Como Elementary School

Peter Grams, Principal Riverview Elementary School

Judy Pappenfus, Director of St. Paul Developmental
Achievement Center

Patricia Strathman, Parent

Sally Wiley Brown, Director Wilder Adolescent
Education Program

Michael Wilson, Parent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Abstract Summary of the Report	1.
II. Background	
A. Mainstreaming - Law, Regulations, Policies	2.
B. Mainstreaming: The Special Education Council's Theme for 1983-84	8.
C. Formation of the Mainstreaming Task Force	8.
D. Development of the Survey	9.
E. Distribution of the Survey	10.
F. Copy of Parents' and Teachers' Surveys	11.
III. Findings	
A. Survey Response Rate	25.
B. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample	25.
C. Analysis of Data	27.
D. Results	
1. Concerns with Mainstreaming	28.
2. Attitudes about Mainstreaming	33.
3. Comparison of Regular Education to Special Education	37.
4. Comparison of Elementary and Secondary Staff Responses	45.
5. Results Regarding Students with Emotional/Behavior Disorders	50.
6. Class Size	51.
7. Effects of Mainstreaming on Academic Achievement	53.
8. Physical Aspects of Mainstreaming	54.
9. Perceptions of Parents	56.
10. Items Requested to Improve Mainstreaming	
a. Aides	58.
b. Support from Special Education Staff	58.
c. Adaptive and Supplemental Materials	59.
d. Inservice Training	60.
11. Summary of Results	62.
IV. Recommendations	
A. School District Policy Regarding Mainstreaming	64.
B. Inservice Training	65.
C. Student Count	65.
D. Mainstream Management Educational Assistant Program	66.
E. Supplemental Instructional Materials and Equipment	66.
F. Special Education Support	67.
G. Appendix	67.
Responses to open ended question #3 on concerns about mainstreaming	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Task Force on Mainstreaming wishes to express our appreciation to the Wilder Foundation's Office of Research and Statistics for their able assistance in extracting the data from the questionnaire, and for their expertise in developing the survey. A very special thank you to Sally Wiley Brown who wrote and rewrote a major body of this report.

We would like to thank Assistant Superintendent, Dr. Erma McGuire, and Ramon S. Firnstahl, Director of Elementary Education Curriculum & Instruction for their interest and involvement in the study.

We express our gratitude to Mr. Charles Hagen and Mr. Bernard R. Dailey of the Special Education staff who provided leadership, information and facilitated the completion of the task. Applause goes to Myrtle Heuer who typed, corrected and retyped the report.

Our appreciation is extended to the Special Education Council for their endorsement of the project, their continued support, interest and for their approval of the report. We also thank the mainstream presenters to the Council for their insights into how mainstreaming is presently functioning in the School District.

We recognize the chairperson and parent, Mrs. Anita Ratwik, for her constant vigilance and persistent effort to see the report to its end in the hope that it will bring enlightenment and assistance in future District planning.

We wish to thank the parents, teachers and support staff who took their time to respond to this questionnaire, by seeing that the results of their responses appear in this report and are heard.

To the Board of Education, for your acknowledging this report and your patient effort to become more informed and aware of the needs of all students in St. Paul and for allocating resources to meet these needs, we are ever grateful.

I. ABSTRACT SUMMARY OF THE TASK FORCE REPORT ON MAINSTREAMING

Eleven percent of the students of St. Paul School District #625 receive some form of special education service. Most of these students are mainstreamed in varying degrees on a daily basis.

Mainstreaming was the focus of the 1983-84 Special Education Council meetings. Reports of strengths and areas of concern were presented from the perspective of the regular education and special education staff from a wide range of mainstreaming environments in the District. As a result, The Task Force on Mainstreaming was formed and charged to study the issues and report to the Council with recommendations for presentation to the St. Paul School Board.

Through a survey directed at the issues that surfaced in the various presentations, input was gathered from 122 of 509 randomly chosen parents of special education students and 458 of the 775 randomly chosen regular and special education teachers, administrators and support staff.

Findings of the survey include the following:

Special education staff are seen as most interested, knowledgeable, and supportive of mainstreaming though the implementation responsibility or "burden" of mainstreaming falls on regular education. Most respondents feel a need for more resources. Class size and teacher work loads are of great concern. Regular education staff are more concerned about the effects of mainstreaming on the regular education student and consider the teacher's attitude less important to the success of that student with special education needs. Special education staff are more concerned about mainstreaming effects on the special education student and in general feel that the more handicapped the student, the more importance teacher attitude has on the success of the experience.

Based on these and the other reported findings of this survey, recommendations relating to student count, staffing patterns and needs, inservice education needs, and suggested strategies for improvement of communication, attitudes, and competencies are addressed.

II. Background

A. Mainstreaming - Law, Regulations, Policies

The word "mainstreaming" is an educational term. In the law, regulations, and rules, "least restrictive environment" is the term which is used. Mainstreaming, i.e. least restrictive environment, is a concept where a special education student is part of a regular education setting to the fullest extent appropriate to the child's needs as opposed to a segregated special education setting. Some special education students were appropriately mainstreamed before the passage of Public Law 94-142, but with this federal law, mainstreaming, being educated in a regular education setting, is now required for each special education student to the extent appropriate for the needs of that particular student. This means that regular education and special education staff must be trained and prepared to meet the needs of the special education student in order to meet the requirements of the law.

The federal Regulation implementing Public Law 94-142, Education of the Handicapped Act, reads as follows.

LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT
§300.550 General.
(a) Each State educational agency shall insure that public agency establishes and implements procedures which meet the requirements of §300.550-300.556.

(b) Each public agency shall insure:
(1) That to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are not handicapped, and
(2) That special classes, separate schooling or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.
(20 U.S.C. 1412 (5XB); 1414 (a) (1) (c) (iv))

§300.551 Continuum of alternative placements.

(a) Each public agency shall insure that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of handicapped children for special education and related services.
(b) The continuum required under paragraph (a) of this section must:
(1) Include the alternative placements listed in the definition of special education under § 300.13 of Sub-part A (instruction in regular classes, special classes, special schools, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions) and
(2) Make provision for supplementary services (such as resource room or itinerant instruction) to be provided in conjunction with regular class placement.
(20 U.S.C. 1412 (5) (B))

§300.552 Placements.

Each public agency shall insure that:
(a) Each handicapped child's educational placement: (1) Is determined at least annually,
(2) Is based on his or her individualized education program, and
(3) Is as close as possible to the child's home;
(b) The various alternative placements included under § 300.551 are available to the extent necessary to implement the individualized educa-

ion program for each handicapped child;
(c) unless a handicapped child's individualized education program required some other arrangement, the child is educated in the school which he or she would attend if not handicapped; and
(d) In selecting the least restrictive environment, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services which he or she needs.
(20 U.S.C. 1412(5)(B))

The comments to these sections state, as quoted from the federal Regulations:

Comment. Section 300.552 includes some of the main factors which must be considered in determining the extent to which a handicapped child can be educated with children who are not handicapped. The overriding rule in this section is that placement decisions must be made on an individual basis. The section also requires each agency to have various alternative placements available in order to insure that each handicapped child receives an education which is appropriate to his or her individual needs.

The analysis of the regulations for Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (34 CFR Part 104-Appendix, Paragraph 24) includes several points regarding educational placements of handicapped children which are pertinent to this section:

1. With respect to determining proper placements, the analysis states:
"*** it should be stressed that, where a handicapped child is so disruptive in a regular classroom that the education of other students is significantly impaired, the needs of the handicapped child cannot be met in that environment. Therefore regular placement would not be appropriate to his or her needs.***"

2. With respect to placing a handicapped child in an alternate setting, the analysis states that among the factors to be considered in placing a child is the need to place the child as close to home as possible. Recipients are required to take this factor into account in making placement decisions. The parents' right to challenge the placement of their child extends not only to placement in special classes or separate schools, but also to placement in a distant school, particularly in a residential program. An equally appropriate education program may exist closer to home; and this issue may be raised by the parent under the due process provisions of this subpart. (End of quote)

Minnesota's Department of Education's Regulation (Rule) which implements

Minnesota Statute Section 120.17, the Minnesota response to P.L. 94-142,

provides:

3525.0400 LEAST RESTRICTIVE ALTERNATIVE

To the extent that there are no detrimental effects, children who are handicapped shall be educated with children who do not have handicaps and shall attend regular classes. A handicapped person shall be removed from a regular educational program only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in a regular educational program cannot be accomplished satisfactorily. Furthermore, there must be an indication that the person will be better served outside of the regular program. The needs of the person shall determine the type and amount of services needed.

MS s 120.17 subd 3

The Administrative plan to carry out this Regulation is Minnesota's Special Education Plan for Fiscal Years 1984 - 86. Chapter VII of this Plan sets out how restrictive environment is to be carried out in Minnesota. The first two paragraphs read as follows, the complete chapter is in the reference section of this report.

CHAPTER VII

LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT

Minnesota's policy of least restrictive alternative appears in Minn. Stat. s 120.17, subd. 3a. (c) which states that every district must insure that to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped persons, including those in public or private institutions or other care facilities are educated with children who are not handicapped, and that special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when and to the extent that the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. This applies to all public agencies in the state that provide educational services to handicapped students as well as private agencies providing educational services to students placed by a public agency.

The definition of education reflects learning in the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains thereby extending the principle of least restrictive alternative to insure that each handicapped child participates in nonacademic and extra-curricular services and activities with nonhandicapped children to the maximum extent appropriate to the needs of the child. This is also supported by Minn. Stat. § 363.03, Unfair Discriminatory Practices, subd. 5.

The St. Paul School Board adopted the following policy on least restrictive environment 5-1-79 as part of its Total Special Education Plan required by the State Department of Education.

PARTICIPATION OF HANDICAPPED STUDENTS
IN SCHOOL PROGRAMS (MAINSTREAMING)

Identification, assessment and placement of handicapped students shall be performed in accordance with procedures set forth in state and federal laws. To the maximum extent appropriate handicapped students of the District will be educated with students who are not handicapped.

Each handicapped student will be placed in the least restrictive instructional environment which will provide an appropriate program to meet that student's education need.

No otherwise qualified handicapped student shall, solely by reason of his or her handicap, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity of the Saint Paul Public Schools. All handicapped students shall receive such services as are prescribed in their individual educational plans.

LEGAL REFS.: M.S. 120.17; P.L. 94-142; P.L. 93-112, Sec. 504

APPLICATION FOR ST. PAUL

The law, regulations, and policies on mainstreaming are very clear. It is not as easy to describe how this affects regular education, a particular student, or a particular teacher in the St. Paul School District. St. Paul has 4,607 students in Special Education. The District has an additional 717 students in special education classes who come from other districts. Some of these students also spend part of their day in the mainstream. These students are divided into six levels depending upon the special education services they receive. Each of

these students affects their regular education peers and teachers in different ways, and are affected by mainstreaming in a different way. Each student's situation is different.

Of the 4,607 St. Paul students in special education, 9 are in Level 1. This includes assessment, monitoring, observation, and follow-up. These students are in a regular education setting the entire day. There are 316 students in Level 2. A Level 2 student is also in a regular education setting the entire time. The regular education teacher provides all instruction. Some modification and adaptation of the curriculum may be included, plus the services in Level 1. There are 2,154 students in Level 3. These students receive a minimum of 50% of their instruction in a regular education setting. They may be in a special education setting as little as an hour a day, or as much as 50% of their day.

There are 529 Level 4 students in the St. Paul School District. These students may be in a regular education setting up to 50% of their day or as little as one hour. There are 1,178 Level 5 students in this District. These students are in a special education setting 100% of their day. There may be some mainstreaming for socialization during the day or for some other objective, but contact is minimal. Lunch, gym and music class are examples where some mainstreaming may occur. There are 421 Level 6 students in the District in residential facilities.

It is not possible to describe in absolutes the effects these students have on regular education because each student is so individual, the amount of time they are in a regular education setting varies greatly, and their particular disability is a strong factor in how easily they are mainstreamed.

The cumulative effect is an issue for this District and its teachers. It is a serious issue which needs attention and teachers need and want help to

meet the requirements of mainstreaming.

B. Mainstreaming: The Special Education Council's Theme for 1983-84

The theme of each Special Education Council meeting in 1983-84 was focused on mainstreaming. The Council heard reports from regular education and special education teachers from a wide variety of programs in the District. These reports included presentations from the following programs.

1. Programs for students with intensive general learning difficulties (I.G.L.D.) at Humboldt, Hayden Heights, and Monroe.
2. Programs for students with emotional/behavioral disorders at Groveland, East Consolidated Eldorado Pod, and Battle Creek Jr. High.
3. Programs for students with hearing impairments at Como Elementary, Highland Complex, and an itinerant teacher working with students with hearing impairments in their home schools.
4. Programs for students with learning disabilities at St. Anthony Park Elementary, Hartzell Program at Como Elementary, Humboldt Jr. High, and Wilder Adolescent Education Program..
5. Programs for students with physical disabilities at Como Elementary, Humboldt Complex, and itinerant services for students with physical impairments at their home schools.
6. Programs for students with visual impairments in the East Metro Region.

The most common strengths and weaknesses which these teachers mention were consistent with this survey's findings about present mainstreaming efforts in St. Paul.

C. Formation of the Mainstreaming Task Force

The Special Education Council discussed the need "to identify

issues as presentations on mainstreaming are given throughout this year" at its October 19th meeting. It was moved and passed that "a task force be formulated to look at issues relating to mainstreaming and in turn report to the Council so that appropriate recommendations could be made to the Board of Education." Both quotes are from the Council's meeting notes from October 19, 1984.

Volunteers to this Task Force included two principals, Ann DeGree, Como Elementary, Peter Grams (now at Riverview), two agency directors, Sally Wiley Brown, Coordinator, Wilder's Adolescent Education Program, Judy Pappenfus, Director, St. Paul's Developmental Achievement Center, and three parents, Pat Strathman, Mike Wilson, and Anita Ratwik. Bernard Dailey, Assistant Director of Curriculum and Instruction - Special Education, was assigned as staff liaison person to help the Task Force. In July, 1984, Dr. Erma McGuire and Charles Hagen also joined the Task Force.

D. Development of the Survey

The Task Force on Mainstreaming began meeting in November, 1983 to gather information about mainstreaming in the St. Paul Schools. At the first meeting of the group, it was decided that information was needed from the broadest spectrum of people in contact with mainstreaming. Sally Wiley Brown Task Force member from the Wilder Foundation, approached their Office of Research and Statistics concerning whether they could help and/or guide the Task Force in the development of the survey. Paul Mattessich from that department was very helpful with the development of the survey questionnaire and Wilder offered

whatever help the Task Force wished to use. Wilder collected surveys, coded responses, tabulated the results and prepared the cross tabulations of the survey.

E. Distribution of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was sent to 509 parents of special education students who had been randomly chosen from those receiving Level 3, 4, or 5 special education services; one hundred and twenty-two parents responded.

Questionnaires were sent to 775 randomly chosen special education teachers, regular education teachers, administrative staff, and support staff. The distribution and responses were as follows:

	<u>Questionnaire sent</u>	<u>Questionnaire answered</u>
Special Education (teachers)	275	164
Regular Education (teachers)	478	225
Administrative Staff	22	18
Support Staff (part of the teachers count)		44
Missing Identification	<u>0</u>	<u>7</u>
Totals	775	458

F. The Surveys

Pages 13-19 are the survey which was sent to the parents. Pages 20-26 are the survey which was sent to the St. Paul school staff. The questions are the same on the two surveys, but the wording has been changed in a few places to fit the situation.

SPECIAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE QUESTIONNAIRE - PARENTS
APRIL, 1984

1. Did you receive information about mainstreaming?

_____ 1. Yes _____ 2. No → GO TO QUESTION 2

+

a. How many years ago? _____ years

b. How would you rate the information you received?

_____ 1. very good

_____ 2. good

_____ 3. fair

_____ 4. poor

2. How would you rate your knowledge about:

	very good	good	fair	poor
a. Disabilities and their implications for children's learning and adjustment?	1	2	3	4
b. The specific skills, weaknesses, and needs of special education students in their classes?	1	2	3	4
c. Special methods of teaching children with disabilities?	1	2	3	4
d. The supportive resources available to help with teaching in mainstream classrooms?	1	2	3	4

3. What present concerns do you have about the effects of mainstreaming?

4. To what degree does each of the following hinder the placement of a special education student in a mainstream class?

	Has a strong effect upon placement	Has a minor effect upon placement	Has no effect upon placement
a. Academic skills	1	2	3
b. Behavioral skills	1	2	3
c. Handicapping Condition	1	2	3
d. Class Size (number of students)	1	2	3
e. Teacher Attitude	1	2	3
f. Availability of Classes	1	2	3
g. Transportation	1	2	3
h. Classroom Aides	1	2	3
i. Availability of Modified Curriculum	1	2	3

5. Do you believe a mainstream teacher's attitude might affect a handicapped student's:

	Very Much	Much	Some	Very Little
a. Placement in that teacher's class	1	2	3	4
b. Academic progress	1	2	3	4
c. Social interaction	1	2	3	4
d. Emotional adjustment & self esteem	1	2	3	4

6. Do you feel that mainstreaming of special education students has any negative impacts upon regular education students?

- ☐ 1. Yes, many negative impacts
☐ 2. Yes, a few negative impacts
☐ 3. No, no negative impacts

If yes, please list specific impacts:

7. Do you feel that mainstreaming of special education students have any positive impacts upon regular education students?

- ____ 1. Yes, many positive impacts
____ 2. Yes, a few positive impacts
____ 3. No, no positive impacts

If yes, please list specific impacts:

8. Do you feel that mainstreaming of special education students has any negative impacts upon special education students?

- ____ 1. Yes, many negative impacts
____ 2. Yes, a few negative impacts
____ 3. No, no negative impacts

If yes, please list specific impacts:

9. Do you feel that mainstreaming of special education students have any positive impacts upon special education students?

- ____ 1. Yes, many positive impacts
____ 2. Yes, a few positive impacts
____ 3. No, no positive impacts

If yes, please list specific impacts:

10. How supportive of mainstreaming are:

	Very Support- ive	Support- ive	Somewhat Support- ive	Not Support- ive
a. District Special Education Administrators	1	2	3	4
b. Principals and Assistant Principals	1	2	3	4
c. Psychologists and Social Workers and Counselors	1	2	3	4
d. Team Leaders and Facilitators	1	2	3	4
e. Special Education Staff (teachers and therapists)	1	2	3	4
f. Regular Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
g. Aides and Volunteers	1	2	3	4
h. Parents	1	2	3	4

11. How informed are the following about the mechanics, regulations, and issues associated with mainstreaming:

	Very Informed	Informed	Somewhat Informed	Not Informed
a. District Special Education Administrators	1	2	3	4
b. Principals and Assistant Principals	1	2	3	4
c. Psychologists and Social Workers and Counselors	1	2	3	4
d. Team Leaders and Facilitators	1	2	3	4
e. Special Education Staff (teachers and therapists)	1	2	3	4
f. Regular Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
g. Aides and Volunteers	1	2	3	4
h. Parents	1	2	3	4

12. Do you need more resources for mainstreaming?

_____ 1. Yes _____ 2. No → → GO TO QUESTION 13

(IF YES) Prioritize the following items as to what you need more of for mainstreaming. (Rank from 1 to 6, with "1" being the most needed.)

- _____ a. Aides
- _____ b. Volunteers
- _____ c. In-service Training
- _____ d. Adaptive and Supplemental Materials
- _____ e. Additional Equipment (audio-visual, computer)
- _____ f. Support from Special Education Teachers and Staff

13. How often do each of the following categories of handicapping conditions encounter resistance to mainstream placement?

	Often	Sometimes	Never
a. Emotional/Behavior Disorder	1	2	3
b. Learning Disabilities	1	2	3
c. General Learning Disabilities	1	2	3
d. Intensive General Learning Disabilities	1	2	3
e. Single Physical Impairment	1	2	3
f. Multihandicapped	1	2	3
g. Hearing Impaired	1	2	3
h. Visually Impaired	1	2	3

14. What present concerns do you have about the transportation of special education students as it relates to mainstreaming?

15. Consider the physical environment in the classroom(s) for both regular education and special education students.

	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. Is/Are the room(s) barrier free for special education students?	1	2	3
b. Do special education students have any difficulty with their equipment, if any, in the rooms?	1	2	3
c. Is there adequate physical size to accomodate students?	1	2	3
d. Is there adequate help to move physically impaired students from place to place?	1	2	3
e. Are the auditory and/or visual distractions such that they detract from the learning process?	1	2	3

16. In what manner do you feel special education students should be counted when determining mainstream class size.

_____ 1. counted only in special education classes and not in the mainstream class enrollment

_____ 2. counted in the mainstream class enrollment as well as in special education class

17. Which of the following best describes the academic achievement of special education students? (Please check one only.)

_____ 1. Special education students progress better academically when they are mainstreamed.

_____ 2. Special education students progress equally in mainstream and special education classes.

_____ 3. Special education students progress better academically in special education classes.

18. If you are a parent of a special education student, please indicate whether student is:

_____ 1. pre-school

_____ 2. elementary

_____ 3. secondary

20. Do you have a child that can best be described as:

1. ____ 1. mildly handicapped
2. ____ 2. moderately handicapped
3. ____ 3. severely handicapped

21. Check below the groups of schools which includes the school in which your child attends.

- ____ 1. Benj E. Mays Fundamental; Harding Senior; Highland Park Senior; Chelsea Heights; Homecroft; St. Anthony Park; Como Park Senior; Wheelock
- ____ 2. Central Senior, Open School, Johnson Senior; Battle Creek Junior; Cleveland Junior; Hazel Park Junior; Highland Park Junior; Murray Junior; Ramsey Junior; Washington Junior; Ames; Battle Creek Elem; Cherokee Heights; Como Park Elem; Dayton's Bluff; Eastern Heights; Farnsworth; Franklin; Frost Lake; Groveland Park; Galtier; Hancock; Highland Park Elem; Hill Elem; Highwood Hills; Jackson; Maxfield; Mississippi; North End; Parkway; Phalen Lake; Prosperity Heights; Riverview; Roosevelt Elem; Sheridan; Webster Magnet
- ____ 3. Humboldt Senior; Humboldt Junior; Secondary ELC/Wash; Como Spec/Hartzell; East Consolidated; Hayden Heights; Longfellow; Mann; Monroe Community School; Randolph Heights;

Thank you for your help!

Please return in enclosed postage-paid envelope to:

Special Education Questionnaire
Office of Research and Statistics
Amherst H. Wilder Foundation
919 Lafond Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104

SPECIAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE QUESTIONNAIRE - TEACHERS
APRIL, 1984

1. Did you receive in-service training about mainstreaming?

____ 1. Yes ____ 2. No → (GO TO QUESTION 2)

- a. How many years ago? ____ years
- b. How would you rate the in-service training you received?
- ____ 1. very good
- ____ 2. good
- ____ 3. fair
- ____ 4. poor

2. How would you rate your knowledge about:

	very good	good	fair	poor
a. Disabilities and their implications for children's learning and adjustment?	1	2	3	4
b. The specific skills, weaknesses, and needs of special education students in their classes?	1	2	3	4
c. Special methods of teaching children with disabilities?	1	2	3	4
d. The supportive resources available to help with teaching in mainstream classrooms?	1	2	3	4

3. What present concerns do you have about the effects of mainstreaming?

4. To what degree does each of the following hinder the placement of a special education student in a mainstream class?

	Has a strong effect upon placement	Has a minor effect upon placement	Has no effect upon placement
a. Academic skills	1	2	3
b. Behavioral skills	1	2	3
c. Handicapping Condition	1	2	3
d. Class Size (number of students)	1	2	3
e. Teacher Attitude	1	2	3
f. Availability of Classes	1	2	3
g. Transportation	1	2	3
h. Classroom Aides	1	2	3
i. Availability of Modified Curriculum	1	2	3

5. Do you believe a mainstream teacher's attitude might affect a handicapped student's:

	Very Much	Much	Some	Very Little
a. Placement in that teacher's class	1	2	3	4
b. Academic progress	1	2	3	4
c. Social interaction	1	2	3	4
d. Emotional adjustment & self esteem	1	2	3	4

6. Do you feel that mainstreaming of special education students has any negative impacts upon regular education students?

- _____ 1. Yes, many negative impacts If yes, please list specific impacts:
 _____ 2. Yes, a few negative impacts _____
 _____ 3. No, no negative impacts _____

7. Do you feel that mainstreaming of special education students have any positive impacts upon regular education students?

- ____ 1. Yes, many positive impacts
____ 2. Yes, a few positive impacts
____ 3. No, no positive impacts

If yes, please list specific impacts:

8. Do you feel that mainstreaming of special education students has any negative impacts upon special education students?

- ____ 1. Yes, many negative impacts
____ 2. Yes, a few negative impacts
____ 3. No, no negative impacts

If yes, please list specific impacts:

9. Do you feel that mainstreaming of special education students have any positive impacts upon special education students?

- ____ 1. Yes, many positive impacts
____ 2. Yes, a few positive impacts
____ 3. No, no positive impacts

If yes, please list specific impacts:

10. How supportive of mainstreaming are:

	Very Support- ive	Support- ive	Somewhat Support- ive	Not Support- ive
a. District Special Education Administrators	1	2	3	4
b. Principals and Assistant Principals	1	2	3	4
c. Psychologists and Social Workers and Counselors	1	2	3	4
d. Team Leaders and Facilitators	1	2	3	4
e. Special Education Staff (teachers and therapists)	1	2	3	4
f. Regular Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
g. Aides and Volunteers	1	2	3	4
h. Parents	1	2	3	4

11. How informed are the following about the mechanics, regulations, and issues associated with mainstreaming:

	Very Informed	Informed	Somewhat Informed	Not Informed
a. District Special Education Administrators	1	2	3	4
b. Principals and Assistant Principals	1	2	3	4
c. Psychologists and Social Workers and Counselors	1	2	3	4
d. Team Leaders and Facilitators	1	2	3	4
e. Special Education Staff (teachers and therapists)	1	2	3	4
f. Regular Education Teachers	1	2	3	4
g. Aides and Volunteers	1	2	3	4
h. Parents	1	2	3	4

12. Do you need more resources for mainstreaming?

_____ 1. Yes _____ 2. No → → GO TO QUESTION 13

(IF YES) Prioritize the following items as to what you need more of for mainstreaming. (Rank from 1 to 6, with "1" being the most needed.)

- _____ a. Aides
- _____ b. Volunteers
- _____ c. Inservice Training
- _____ d. Adaptive and Supplemental Materials
- _____ e. Additional Equipment (audio-visual, computer)
- _____ f. Support from Special Education Teachers and Staff

13. How often do each of the following categories of handicapping conditions encounter resistance to mainstream placement?

	Often	Sometimes	Never
a. Emotional/Behavior Disorder	1	2	3
b. Learning Disabilities	1	2	3
c. General Learning Disabilities	1	2	3
d. Intensive General Learning Disabilities	1	2	3
e. Single Physical Impairment	1	2	3
f. Multihandicapped	1	2	3
g. Hearing Impaired	1	2	3
h. Visually Impaired	1	2	3

14. What present concerns do you have about the transportation of special education students as it relates to mainstreaming?

15. Consider the physical environment in the classroom(s) for both regular education and special education students.

	Yes	No	Don't Know
a. Is/Are the room(s) barrier free for special education students?	1	2	3
b. Do special education students have any difficulty with their equipment, if any, in the rooms?	1	2	3
c. Is there adequate physical size to accommodate students?	1	2	3
d. Is there adequate help to move physically impaired students from place to place?	1	2	3
e. Are the auditory and/or visual distractions such that they detract from the learning process?	1	2	3

16. In what manner do you feel special education students should be counted when determining mainstream class size.

☐ 1. counted only in special education classes and not in the mainstream class enrollment
 ☐ 2. counted in the mainstream class enrollment as well as in special education class

17. Which of the following best describes the academic achievement of special education students? (Please check one only.)

- ☐ 1. Special education students progress better academically when they are mainstreamed.
☐ 2. Special education students progress equally in mainstream and special education classes.
☐ 3. Special education students progress better academically in special education classes.

18. Please indicate whether you are:

- a. ☐ 1. regular education teacher, or
☐ 2. special education teacher, or
☐ 3. administrator, or
☐ 4. support staff

- b. ☐ 1. in pre-school setting
☐ 2. in elementary setting
☐ 3. in secondary setting

19. Do you work with students that can best be described as:

- ☐ 1. mildly handicapped
☐ 2. moderately handicapped
☐ 3. severely handicapped

20. Check below the groups of schools which includes the school in which you teach.

- ☐ 1. Benj E. Mays Fundamental; Harding Senior; Highland Park Senior; Chelsea Heights; Homecroft; St. Anthony Park; Como Park Senior; Wheelock
- ☐ 2. Central Senior, Open School, Johnson Senior; Battle Creek Junior; Cleveland Junior; Hazel Park Junior; Highland Park Junior; Murray Junior; Ramsey Junior; Washington Junior; Ames; Battle Creek Elem; Cherokee Heights; Como Park Elem; Dayton's Bluff; Eastern Heights; Farnsworth; Franklin; Frost Lake; Groveland Park; Galtier; Hancock; Highland Park Elem; Hill Elem; Highwood Hills; Jackson; Maxfield; Mississippi; North End; Parkway; Phalen Lake; Prosperity Heights; Riverview; Roosevelt Elem; Sheridan; Webster Magnet
- ☐ 3. Humboldt Senior; Humboldt Junior; Secondary ELC/Wash; Como Spec/Hartzell; East Consolidated; Hayden Heights; Longfellow; Mann; Monroe Community School; Randolph Heights;

Thank you for your help!

Please return in enclosed postage-paid envelope to:

Special Education Questionnaire
Office of Research and Statistics
Amherst H. Wilder Foundation
919 Lafond Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104

III. FINDINGS

A. Survey Response Rate

The response rate from school staff was positive with 59% of those surveyed returning questionnaires. However, there were differences in response rates from various subgroups. About 76% of special education staff polled responded while 47% of regular education staff responded. The response rate of parents was significantly lower than staff with only 24% of the parents returning the survey.

B. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

The demographic breakdown of those returning surveys including information on level of school, type of handicap, job position, and percentage of students with handicaps enrolled in the facility are presented in Table I.

TABLE I

Demographic Characteristics

SCHOOL STAFF

<u>School Level</u>	<u>#</u>	<u>%</u>
Preschool	19	4
Elementary	218	48
Secondary	200	44
Missing	21	5
Total	458	101%

Type of Handicap

Mild	185	40
Moderate	105	23
Severe	88	19
Missing	80	18
Total	458	100%

Position

Administrator	18	4
Support Staff	44	10
Special Ed Teacher	164	36
Regular Ed Teacher	225	49
Missing	7	2
Total	458	101%

Percent Handicap in Facility

School Group 1 (0-10.4%)	48	10
School Group 2 (10.5%-18.3%)	260	57
School Group 3 (18.4%+)	101	22
Missing	49	11
Total	458	100%

TABLE I
Demographic Characteristics

PARENT

Level of Service

3	30	25
4	30	25
5	42	34
Missing	20	16
Total	<u>122</u>	<u>100%</u>

Level of School

Preschool	24	20
Elementary	48	39
Secondary	33	27
Missing Data	17	14
Total	<u>122</u>	<u>100%</u>

The table shows that of those returning surveys only 4% of the staff represented preschoolers while 48% were from elementary schools and 44% were from secondary schools. Those working primarily with students with mild handicaps were most strongly represented (40%). Teachers of students with moderate and severe handicaps accounted for 23% and 19% respectively.

Regular education teachers represented 49% of the total respondents. Special education teachers were 36% of the sample. Support staff accounted for 10% of the responses and administrators for 4%. The majority of responses (57%) came from schools where students with handicaps were from 10.5% and 18.3% of the total enrollment. Ten percent of the responses came from schools with relatively few students with handicaps and 11% from schools with high concentration of students with handicaps. Parent responses revealed a fairly even distribution of responses across levels of service and across level of schools.

C. Analysis of Data

In order to organize the data, the committee analyzed the data in a variety of subgroupings or cross tabulations. Ten primary groupings were developed. They are listed below with a brief rationale for their inclusion.

Cross tab 1: School staff by level of the school they represent. It was felt there might be differences in experiences with and concerns about mainstreaming in preschool, elementary and secondary school settings.

Cross tab 2: Parents by level of service their child was receiving. It was felt there might be differences in attitude and perception of mainstreaming based on severity of handicap.

Cross tab 3: School staff by degree of handicapping condition of students with which they work. It was felt that concerns with and effects of mainstreaming might vary depending on the severity of the handicap of the students with which a teacher had the most contact.

Cross tab 4 & 5: School staff by role or job position. It was the interest of the committee to see if there were different perceptions of mainstreaming among administrators, support staff, regular education teachers, and special education teachers.

Cross tab 6: Regular education teachers by self evaluation regarding knowledge about mainstreaming. The committee was interested in finding out if staff who rated their knowledge as good or very good would differ in attitudes and perceptions of mainstreaming when compared to those who rated themselves as having only fair or poor knowledge.

Cross tab 7: Special education teachers by knowledge rating. The rationale is the same for Cross tab 6.

Cross tab 8: School staff by concentration of students with handicaps in a facility. The Task Force was aware that certain schools have high concentrations of students with handicaps and felt the impact of the number of students might lead to different concerns and issues regarding mainstreaming.

Cross tab 9: Parents by level of school their child was enrolled in. It was felt issues might vary from preschool to elementary or secondary settings.

Cross tab 10: Regular education teachers by whether or not they received inservice training about mainstreaming. The Task Force was interested to determine what impact inservice education might have on attitude and perceptions of mainstreaming.

D. Results

1. Concerns with Mainstreaming

There appears to be both interest in and concern about mainstreaming. When asked if more resources were needed for mainstreaming, an overwhelming majority (over 80%) of respondents said yes. Ninety-four percent of the administrators polled said more resources were needed. Eighty-one percent of the regular education teachers, and 86% of special education staff were affirmative.

When asked to address present concerns about mainstreaming, 77% of those responding listed concerns. See Appendix 1 page The coding structure used to analyze those responses is listed in Table 2. Many respondents listed more than once concern, but data was coded into only one category based on the first concern stated. (See Table 3)

Table 2
Coding Structure for Question 3

- 00 None
- 01 Negative effect on special education students - social (teasing; low self-esteem)
- 02 Negative effect on special education students - academic education (lack of time and abilities; push too hard)
- 03 Negative effect on regular education students - social (behavior of special education students; not alert to problems)
- 04 Negative effect on regular education students - academic education (lack of time)
- 05 Teachers' lack of abilities/knowledge
- 06 Teachers' need of resources and support; personnel; training
- 07 Teachers' increased work load, classrooms too big, proportion of special education, ratio, no time)
- 08 Teachers' lack of desire, willingness to help/support, bad attitude
- 09 Lack of guidelines on determining eligibility for mainstreaming, proper placement
- 10 Question whether needs in general are adequately met
- 11 More communication between regular and special education teachers regarding students
- 12 Other
- 77 Inappropriate answer
- 88 Not applicable
- 99 Don't know

- Blank: did not answer this question

Table 3
Concerns About Mainstreaming
Percentage of Responses

	Regular Education Teachers	Special Education Teachers	Total Teachers
None	27%	12%	21%
Teachers' increased workload	15	12	14
Negative effect on special education students: academic	6	12	9
Other	8	9	8
Negative effect on regular education students: academic	12	2	8
Negative effect on special education students: social	4	9	6
Teachers' lack of resources and support	5	8	6
Teachers' lack of knowledge	4	8	6
Needs not being adequately met	7	3	5
Teachers' negative attitude toward mainstreaming	1	11	5
Lack of guidelines for eligi- bility	4	6	5
Lack of communication be- tween regular and special education	4	5	4
Don't know	3	1	2
Negative effect on regular education students: social	0	1	.5
Not applicable/inappropriate	0	.6	.3
	100%	100%	100%

a. Analysis of First Concern Stated

The most frequently mentioned concern by far was the increased work load of teachers. Comments included statements regarding large class size, special education students requiring more time and attention, too many special education students being added to individual regular classes, more requirements for staffings and paperwork, and teachers being already overworked. Some of the language in comments was quite strong. Words used were stress, burden, pressure, strain, overwhelmed and even "it's a reason to quit".

Class size and teacher time were cited over and over again in comments from both regular and special education staff. Very strong feelings were expressed with many negative comments regarding the difficulty mainstreaming places on staff.

The second major area of concern was the negative impact mainstreaming had on the academic achievement of special education students. Comments included statements that students were not learning, were not being able to keep up or do the work in the classroom, were not having their needs met, were being lost and frustrated, were being given "watered down" grades and were not getting individual attention or modified curriculum.

The next area of concern was the negative impact mainstreaming had on the academic progress of regular education students. Again, many strong statements were made about mainstreaming taking time away from regular students. Statements included language such as: cheating, unjust, unfair, to the detriment of, decreasing the quality of instruction, tremendous drain, and average students suffer.

There were differences in concerns when regular education and special education responses are compared. Special education staff were more

likely to express concerns, while regular education staff did not list concerns as frequently. Increased teacher work load was highest for both groups, though more frequently addressed by regular education teachers. Special education staff rated the concern about the academic progress of special education students equal to teachers' increased work load. Their next area of concern was a lack of support for mainstreaming on the part of teachers, presumably regular education teachers.

Regular education teachers rated work load first followed by the negative effect on the academic progress of regular education students. The next concern they expressed related to whether or not students' needs in general were being met.

b. Analysis of All Concerns Stated

The above data is based on the coding of each respondent's concerns into one primary category. Observation of all the comments reveals that in addition to work load and effects on academic progress of students, several other types of responses were frequently cited. The need for supportive resources in the form of adaptive materials, personnel and aides was often mentioned. Teachers' lack of knowledge and need for training were also noted frequently. There were numerous comments about the need for better communication between regular and special education.

Another area which was addressed strongly, but does not show up in the analysis of first comments, was concern regarding students with disruptive behavior, and problems with students with emotional and behavioral disorders.

The responses to the question regarding concerns about mainstreaming reveal reservations about the success of mainstreaming and its impact

on the education of both regular and special students.

2. Attitudes about Mainstreaming

While there were significant concerns about the implementation of mainstreaming, there was strong support for the values and principles involved. Over 80% of the entire group felt there were positive impacts on regular education students, and over 90% noted positive impacts on special education students. Comments indicated that regular education students benefit by improving their understanding and acceptance of others and that special education students benefit by increasing their socialization, being exposed to the real world, and by learning to accept themselves. The positive attitudes toward mainstreaming related almost entirely to interpersonal issues. There was much less support for mainstreaming's benefits academically. Less than a quarter of respondents (21%) felt students progressed better academically when mainstreamed. As noted earlier there was great concern expressed with the implementation of mainstreaming and its effect on classroom instruction.

In general, most groups were seen as supportive of mainstreaming (see Table 4) although a real difference between special and regular education was reported.

Table 4

Support of Mainstreaming

Percentages of Responses of all school staff

	Very Supportive & Supportive	Somewhat Supportive & Not Supportive
Special Education Teachers	89%	11%
Psychologists and Social Workers	86	14
Parents	79	21
Team Leaders and Facilitators	78	22
District Special Education Administrators	74	26
Principals and Assistant Principals	65	35
Aides and Volunteers	63	37
Regular Education Teachers	41	59

District special education administrators were rated by 74% of respondents as either supportive or very supportive while principals and assistant principals were rated as supportive by 65% of respondents. This figure suggests stronger support by special education and also indicated that about one-third of building administrators are not perceived to be supportive of mainstreaming. The discrepancies were even greater for teachers. Special education teachers were rated as

supportive or very supportive by 89% of respondents while only 41% rated regular education teachers as supportive. This large discrepancy between special and regular education with respect to mainstreaming was evident throughout the data and will be addressed in a separate section of this report.

Data from the questionnaire indicated that teacher attitude is a crucial factor in student success. The fact that three out of every five regular education teachers were not seen as supportive of mainstreaming suggests serious problems for students with handicaps.

Teacher attitude was felt to have hindered the placement of special education students in mainstream settings (78% of respondents rating). In a similar question 64% of the respondents felt that teacher attitude had a very great effect on placement in that teacher's class. Since the majority of regular education teachers are not seen as supportive, it could be inferred that students frequently are not being mainstreamed into certain teachers' classes. This suggests students may not get mainstreamed even if it is appropriate. Once in a class, teacher attitude was also felt to have a strong effect on social interaction (53%), academic progress (57%), and especially on emotional adjustment and self esteem (71%).

There were some variations based on subgroups which suggest that groups with more knowledge and experience with students with handicaps feel that teacher attitude has a greater effect on students' performance. (See Table 5) Parents consistently were higher than teachers in their ratings of the effect of attitude. Special educators and support staff noted a greater effect than regular education and

Table 5
Percentage of Group Rating Teacher Attitude
as Having Very Great Effect

	Emotional Adjustment	Placement in Class	Academic Progress	Social Interaction
Parents	75%	67%	62%	54%
Teachers	67	61	53	52
Elementary Teachers	74	59	59	56
Secondary Teachers	53	57	46	38
Special Education Teachers	75	74	65	60
Support Staff	75	59	57	55
Administrators	61	50	65	44
Regular Education Teachers	56	48	44	40
Regular Education High Knowledge	69	66	62	61
Regular Education Low Knowledge	52	44	38	33
High Concentration Schools	68	56	56	50
Low Concentration Schools	51	47	49	44
Severely Handicapped	77	74	69	59
Mildly Handicapped	59	49	45	45
Had Inservice	59	54	45	43
Had No Inservice	53	44	44	37

administrators. Schools with higher concentrations of students with handicaps had more ratings of strong effects than schools with fewer students with handicaps.

Both teachers and parents of students with more severe handicaps felt attitude had a greater effect than those primarily associated with individuals with milder handicaps. Regular education teachers who rated themselves as having good or very good knowledge about disabilities rated the effects of teacher attitude equivalent to special education teachers. Inservice, however, seemed to have no effect on ratings of the importance of teachers' attitude. Teachers in elementary schools also rated attitude as having a greater effect than did secondary school teachers.

The implications of these responses to questions regarding teacher attitude are significant. Regular education teachers are not viewed, even when rated by themselves, as being supportive of mainstreaming. They list as their major concerns the extra work which is resultant from inclusion of students with handicaps in their classes. They further question whether students' needs are being met and note that mainstreaming may be detrimental to academic progress of regular education students. The negative feelings of staff may produce negative impacts on mainstreamed students because teacher attitude has a strong effect on placement, student performance, and self-esteem.

3. Comparison of Regular Education to Special Education

The vast difference in responses between regular education teachers and special education teachers is evident throughout the survey and reveals a major issue with respect to the integration of students with handicaps into mainstream settings.

At present mainstreaming would appear to be a special education responsibility. Special education staff are more interested in; supportive of, and knowledgeable about mainstreaming.

Data supporting this statement include: significantly more special education staff returned surveys (75% versus 47%), more special education staff responded to the question on concerns about mainstreaming (88% versus 73%), and special education staff were rated much more frequently as supportive of mainstreaming (87% versus 25% to 37%) than were regular education staff. (See Table 6)

Table 6
Comparison of Special Education to Regular Education Teachers' Ratings
on How Supportive Various Groups are of Mainstreaming

	Regular	Special
Ratings of Very Supportive and Supportive for:		
District Special Education Administrators	82%	81%
Principals and Assistant Principals	75	63
Psychologists and Social Workers	82	76
Team Leaders and Facilitators	81	85
Special Education Staff	87	87
Regular Education Teachers	37	25
Aides and Volunteers	62	63
Parents	62	70

Special education staff also rated the impacts of mainstreaming more positively than regular educators did (64% versus 34% for special education students and 55% versus 30% for regular education students. (See Table 7)

Table 7
Comparison of Regular Education and Special Education
on Assessment of Impacts of Mainstreaming

	Regular	Special
Many Negative Impacts of Regular Education Students	16%	8%
Many Positive Impacts of Regular Education Students	30	55
Many Negative Impacts of Special Education Students	14	11
Many Positive Impacts of Special Education Students	34	61

Special education staff were consistently rated as much more knowledgeable about disabilities (95% versus 50%) and teaching methodology (92% versus 27%) than regular education staff. (See Table 8 A & B)

Table 8A
Comparison of Special Education to Regular Education
on Self Rating of Knowledge

	Regular	Special
Ratings of very good and good on knowledge about		
a. Disabilities	50%	95%
b. Needs of Special Education students	44	98
c. Methods of Teaching Children with disabilities	27	92
d. Supportive resources available	41	65

Table 8B
Comparison of Special Education to Regular Education on
Knowledge about Mainstreaming of Various Groups

	Regular	Special
Ratings of very informed and informed for:		
District Special Education Administrators	86%	81%
Principals and Assistant Principals	76	61
Psychologists and Social Workers	87	80
Team Leaders and Facilitators	81	88
Special Education Staff	94	88
Regular Education Teachers	31	25
Aides and Volunteers	36	20
Parents	33	18

They were also rated by regular education staff as more knowledgeable about mainstreaming (94% versus 31%). There appears to be agreement that special education staff is more supportive of and knowledgeable about mainstreaming than regular education staff. However, mainstreaming occurs in regular education classes, which means that those implementing it are not the "experts" nor are they those who are supportive. There appear to be some issues or special interests which lead to conflict between the staffs.

Special education teachers are more concerned with special education students, regular education teachers are more concerned with regular education students.

Regular education teachers approach teaching from the perspective of large group instruction focused on content areas, with the teachers concentrating on group management and organization, and with evaluation of success based on how well a student fits in with the group. Special education teachers approach teaching from the perspective of one to one instruction focused on task analysis and skill development with the teachers concentrating on personal interaction and behavior management, and with evaluation of success based on diagnostic issues and individual growth and goal attainment. As a result, the two groups have different concerns about mainstreaming and its impact on the education of students. Resentment is noted on both sides. Special education staff feel many regular education teachers have a "bad attitude", while regular education teachers feel many special education staff are not communicative or helpful, and that they are unrealistic.

In addition to the differences in knowledge, concerns, and support for mainstreaming varying opinions were seen in other areas. In terms of placement of students in the mainstream, special education teachers felt much more strongly that behavior, academic skills, and teacher attitude hinder the integration of students. (See table 9)

Table 9
Comparison of Regular to Special Education on How Various
Factors Hinder Placement in Mainstream

	Regular	Special
Ratings of Strong Effect for:		
Academic Skills	67%	78%
Behavioral Skills	69	91
Handicapping Condition	39	43
Class Size	67	68
Teacher Attitude	47	83
Availability of Classes	52	58
Transportation	39	29
Aides	44	38
Modified Curriculum	51	52

While neither group ranked transportation as a significant hinderance to a mainstream placement, regular education teachers did seer it as more of a problem than special education teachers did. Both groups ranked behavioral skills as the most significant hindrance (regular education staff 69%; special education staff 91%). Special education staff ranked teacher attitude as the second largest hindrance (83%), followed by academic skills (78%). Regular education staff ranked academic skills and class size as the next hindrance after behavior. The discrepancy between staff perception of the importance of teacher attitude was noted before and is very significant. (See table 10)

Table 10
Comparison of Regular to Special Education on the Effects
of Teacher Attitudes on Various Factors

	Regular	Special
Ratings of Very Much and Much Effect on:		
Placement	68%	89%
Academic Progress	71	93
Social Interaction	67	82
Emotional Adjustment	80	96

Special education staff consistently rated attitude as having more of an effect on students than regular education staff did, though they did rank them in the same order. They agreed that attitude had the greatest effects on emotional adjustment (special staff 96%, regular staff 80%) next on academic achievement (93% versus 71%), placement (89% versus 68%) and next on social interactions (82% versus 67%).

Another area where differences were seen between regular and special education was the resistance to mainstreaming encountered by various categories of handicapping conditions. (See Table 11)

Table 11
Comparison of Special Education to Regular Education on the
Resistance to Mainstreaming for Various Handicapping Conditions

	Regular	Special
Ratings of Office Encounter Resistance:		
Emotional/Behavioral Disorder	69%	87%
Learning Disabilities	20	20
General Learning Disabilities	20	29
Intensive Learning Disabilities	63	71
Single Physical Impairment	3	9
Multihandicapped	31	63
Hearing Impaired	11	19
Visually Impaired	16	22

There was general agreement in the rank order, with Emotional Behavioral Disorders meeting most resistance, followed by Intensive General Learning Disabilities, and Multiply Handicapped. Regular education staff ranked Learning Disabilities fourth and General Learning Disabilities (GLD) fifth while special education staff ranked General Learning Disabilities fourth, Visually Impaired fifth and Learning Disabilities sixth. While rankings are similar, more special education teachers noted the resistance (Emotional/Behavioral Disorders-special education 87%, regular education 69%, Intensive General Learning Disabilities-special education 71%, regular education 63%, Multiply Handicapped special education 63%, regular education 31%. It is unclear what the implications of these data might be, though they could mean special education teachers are more aware of students who might be mainstreamed if there were less resistance, or that special education teachers have more contact with situations involving students who are mainstreamed, or that they might be assessing unrealistically and that there is less resistance than they feel.

The above observations that mainstreaming appears to be more of a special education concern, that regular educators see less impact of

factors on mainstream placement, less impact of teacher attitude, less resistance to mainstreaming students with varying handicaps, and that they are less supportive may indicate that regular education staff feel somewhat powerless concerning decisions about mainstreaming. It seems likely from comments that regular education teachers feel students are "dumped" in their classes without their input.

This lack of involvement in decision making and programming for mainstreaming would appear to be significant in terms of attitude.

Neither group noted major problems related to the physical aspects of mainstreaming. (See Table 12)

Table 12
Comparison of Special Education to Regular Education on
Physical Aspects of Mainstreaming

	Regular	Special
Negative Responses Indicating Problems:		
Barrier Free Rooms	32%	27%
Equipment Difficulties	25	21
Adequate Physical Size Classes	34	35
Adequate Help to Move Physically Impaired Students	38	29
Auditory/Visual Distractions	38	53

There was one difference in the data relating to auditory and visual distractions. Fifty-three percent of the special education staff indicated that mainstreamed settings did have distractions that detracted from learning, while only 38% of regular education staff made that assessment. There may be some difficulties for students in mainstream settings with respect to distracting environments.

The final area of difference was seen in response to a question about resources needed to improve mainstreaming. (See table 13)

Table 13
Comparison of Special Education to Regular Education
on Prioritized Needs for Mainstreaming (rank order)

	Regular	Special
Aides	1st	4th
Adaptive and Supplemental Materials	2nd	1st
Support from Special Education Staff	3rd	3rd
Inservice Training	4th	2nd
Additional Equipment	5th	5th
Volunteers	6th	6th

Regular education staff ranked aides as their first choice, followed by adaptive and supplemental materials, support from special education staff, and inservice training. Their requests relate to immediate classroom needs for assistance with the task of integrating students with handicaps. Inservice training, a more indirect service, ranked lower. Special education staff requested adaptive materials first, inservice training second, support from special education staff third, and aides fourth. While it is not clear, one would guess that special education teachers were making these suggestions relative to regular education teachers, i.e., inservice for regular education teachers.

In summary, survey results reveal differences between regular education teachers and special education teachers. Mainstreaming appears to be viewed as a special education issue or interest, but with the burden of implementation falling on regular education teachers who are less supportive and who have less expertise. Regular education teachers expressed the need for support in order to make mainstreaming viable.

4. Comparison of Elementary and Secondary Staff Responses

Responses revealed some differences between elementary and secondary schools with respect to mainstreaming.

There was a general trend toward secondary school staff being less knowledgeable and supportive of mainstreaming. Yet secondary staff reported less resistance and fewer barriers to mainstreaming than did elementary staff. They also responded somewhat more positively to questions regarding the physical aspects of mainstreaming.

Secondary staff rated themselves lower with respect to knowledge about mainstreaming and disabilities. They also rated school administrators as somewhat less knowledgeable than elementary staff did.

(See Table 14)

Table 14
Ratings of Knowledge as Very Good and Good

	Elementary	Secondary
Knowledge About Disabilities	73%	67%
Knowledge About Specific Skills, Weaknesses, and Needs of Special Education Students	70	66
Knowledge About Special Methods of Teaching	57	51
Knowledge About Supportive Resources	57	48
How Informed are Principals and Assistant Principals About Mainstreaming	74	69
How Informed are Regular Education Teachers	36	24

Secondary staff also appeared to be less supportive of mainstreaming (40% for elementary versus 25% for secondary), and generally saw other groups as less supportive than elementary teachers did. (See Table 15)

Table 15
Support for Mainstreaming

	Elementary	Secondary
How Supportive Are:		
Special Education Staff	82%	82%
Team Leaders/Facilitators	85	81
Psychologists, Social Workers, Counselors	83	77
District Special Education Administrators	82	82
Principals and Assistant Principals	78	73
Parents	69	62
Aides and Volunteers	66	61
Regular Education Teachers	40	25

Secondary teachers further saw fewer positive benefits for students and more negative impacts on students resulting from mainstreaming. Only 40% of the secondary teachers polled felt there were many positive effects for special education students. (See Table 16)

Table 16
Impacts of Mainstreaming on Students

	Elementary	Secondary
Many Negative Impacts on Regular Education Students	9%	14%
Many Positive Impacts on Regular Education Students	48	33
Many Negative Impacts on Special Education Students	9	17
Many Positive Impacts on Special Education Students	52	40

In addition to being less supportive, secondary teachers felt that teacher attitude is less significant than elementary teachers did. (See Table 17)

Table 17
Effects of Teacher Attitude on Student Variables

	Elementary Staff	Elementary Parents	Secondary Staff	Secondary Parents
Placement in a Teachers class	80%	83%	73%	82%
Academic Progress	87	91	74	85
Social Interaction	86	83	62	79
Emotional Adjustment and Self Esteem	93	89	78	94

While there is probably some validity to the differences based on the fact that teenagers are less influenced by teachers, it seems likely that the difference also reflects a different perspective taken by secondary teachers. They are primarily trained to teach a certain subject area and are generally less oriented to the learner than elementary teachers. Parents of both elementary and secondary students rated teacher attitude as extremely important, with no difference by school level. Parent ratings were fairly close to elementary teachers' ratings, which suggests that secondary teachers may be underestimating their impact. All these factors suggest that mainstreaming may be more difficult in secondary school settings.

While secondary staff were less positive about mainstreaming they reported fewer barriers to the integration of students than elementary teachers did. (See Table 18)

Table 18
Hindrances to Mainstream Placement

	Elementary	Secondary
Academic Skills	71%	71%
Behavioral Skills	84	71
Handicapping Condition	42	38
Class Size (number of students)	69	67
Teacher Attitude	74	63
Availability of Classes	55	54
Transportation	41	27
Classroom Aides	44	39
Availability of Modified Curriculum	49	54

Fairly significant differences were reported with respect to assessment of the effect of behavioral skills, teacher attitude and transportation on placement, with elementary staff seeing them as being a much greater barrier.

Secondary staff also reported less resistance to students with handicapping conditions, with the largest differences reported for Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (84% of elementary staff versus 69% of secondary staff), Intensive General Learning Disabilities (72% versus 63%), and Multiply Handicapped (55% versus 38%). These data appear to be somewhat inconsistent, yet might reflect less attention to non-academic issues at the secondary level, or a feeling that students with handicaps are put into mainstream classes without adequate joint planning.

In terms of physical aspects of mainstreaming, secondary staff were generally more positive than elementary teachers. They noted barrier free environments with adequate space. They reported fewer auditory and visual distractions than elementary teachers. More secondary staff also felt there was adequate help to move students with physical impairments (36% versus 25%). However, they noted more problems with special equipment (30% versus 19%).

Both secondary and elementary teachers requested more resources to support mainstreaming. Elementary staff prioritized needs in the following order: first, adaptive and supplemental materials; second, inservice; third, aides. Secondary staff ranked needs: first, adaptive materials; second, aides; third, support from special education staff. While secondary staff did not feel knowledgeable about mainstreaming, they requested direct support more frequently than inservice education. The data indicate that of the 43% of secondary staff who had inservice training most (70%) indicated they had participated in the last five years. More elementary staff received

training over five years ago (41%). It may be that the difference in time affected desire for inservice, or it might be that secondary staff prefer more tangible, immediate support for mainstreaming.

In summary results indicate that secondary teachers are generally less knowledgeable and supportive of mainstreaming. They do not feel that teacher attitude has as much of an effect on students as elementary staff do. They are somewhat more positive of their assessment of physical aspects of mainstreaming, but do not feel mainstreaming is a very positive experience for students. When asked what they need to support mainstreaming, secondary staff do not request inservice, but indicate an interest in more direct support for classroom activities (materials, aides, support from special education staff).

These results suggest that the integration of handicapped students in secondary schools may be easier to accomplish logistically, yet more difficult programmatically. It would seem that secondary students might experience less personal support and might not have their needs met as effectively as elementary students.

5. Results Regarding Students with Emotional/Behavior Disorders

The data suggest that there may be great difficulty mainstreaming students with behavior problems.

As noted earlier there were many comments from staff regarding discipline problems and disruptive behavior which occur with special education students in the mainstream. Examples of statements from teachers are: "So many emotionally disturbed students are entering my school and we can't service them adequately. They are giving teachers negative views of special education and that's terrible.

These severely handicapped emotionally disturbed students should not be in regular high school." "My present concern is with those students who have behavior problems, not learning problems, and the effect of misbehavior on the majority of students." "We need answers to deal with the emotionally disturbed child."

Teachers also consistently (83%) rated behavioral skills as being the greatest hindrance to placement in a mainstream class, and indicated that students with behavior disorders frequently meet resistance to mainstream placement (82%). Other groups were seen much less frequently encountering resistance (Learning Disabled 23%, General Learning Disabilities 24%, Intensive General Learning Disabilities 70%, Physically Impaired 9%, Multiply Handicapped 54%, Hearing Impaired 20%, Visually Impaired 23%).

Since teacher attitude was felt to be a significant influence on students' social interaction, emotional adjustment, and self esteem, it is important to be aware of teachers' frustration, feelings of inadequacy, and resistance with respect to the integration of students with emotional and behavior disorders.

Responses suggest that services for students with Emotional/Behavior Disorders may need improvement and that more needs to be done to deal with the impact of such students in the schools.

6. Class Size

Teachers are very concerned with class size. They see their effectiveness eroded by the large number of students they have to deal with. One teacher queried, "With the present teacher pupil ratio, how does one adequately serve the educational and emotional needs of the students?" Teachers further feel that the integration of students with handicaps into already large classes adds to their burden, is

detrimental to regular education students, and shortchanges special education students. One teacher wrote, "I have found that a special education student generally needs more attention from the teacher. With class sizes always increasing this becomes more and more difficult and I don't want to slight the other children." Teachers seemed frustrated that they did not have time to meet the needs of students' in their classes.

A related concern was voiced with respect to the number of students with handicaps who might be placed in one mainstream class. An example of this concern was stated, "Mainstream classes are too large. It's not fair to expect special attention to handicapped kids when they have 4 to 6 in class plus regular kids."

On the survey 71% of the teachers responding indicated that class size often hinders placement in mainstream classes. This figure suggests that more students might benefit from mainstreaming but are kept out because of the number of students in classes.

The request for aides from teachers also reflects their feeling of inadequacy in their ability to meet the needs of students in their classes.

Teachers also revealed concern for the amount of extra work and effort that went into programming for special education students and therefore questioned the counting procedures utilized in the District. One teacher commented, "The mainstreamed student in a regular education classroom should count for a minimum of 2-3 regular education students." On the survey question regarding the manner of counting special education students in mainstream classes an overwhelming 96% felt students should be counted in both special education and in mainstream class enrollment.

In summary class size is perceived by teachers to be a significant factor in their ability to meet the needs of both regular and special education students. They question placement procedures which allow several special education students in one regular class. They also disagree with the present policy of counting Level IV and V students only in special education.

7. Effects of Mainstreaming on Academic Achievement

Survey results indicate that there is support for the social benefit of mainstreaming. Responses are much less positive with respect to academic benefit.

Over one-third of the teachers (36%) expressed concern about the negative impact the integration of students with handicaps had on the academic progress of regular students.

About the same level of concern (37%) was expressed with respect to the academic progress of special education students.

When specifically asked about the academic progress of special education students only 23% of teachers felt they progressed better when mainstreamed. Another 34% felt students progressed equally in special education and mainstreamed classes. Preschool teachers were the most positive. Elementary and secondary teachers were fairly similar in their assessment, with only 22% indicating better progress when mainstreamed, 31% indicating equal progress and 48% indicating better progress in special education classes.

Parents strongly expressed the feeling that children with handicaps progress better academically in special classes. Over half of the parents of children in Levels IV and V said their children progressed better in special education. Parents of secondary students also expressed this feeling more frequently (58%) than parents of elementary students (42%).

The only group which viewed academic achievement differently and positively was school administrators. Ninety-four percent felt special education students progressed better (44%) or equally (50%) in their academic achievement when placed in mainstream classes. Perhaps their perspective is more theoretical than practical. Research generally does support the finding that academic achievement is at least equal when students are mainstreamed. The perceptions of parents and teachers do not support that attitude.

8. Physical Aspects of Mainstreaming

In general there are positive perceptions of the physical environment for mainstreaming in St. Paul.

With respect to whether or not rooms are barrier free, half of most groups felt they were while about one-third felt they were not. The remainder responded that they didn't know. While this response is fairly positive the fact that about one in every three people polled felt rooms weren't barrier free suggests that the District's Plan to modify schools should continue.

When asked about the physical size of classrooms about half of the people surveyed felt there was adequate space, one-third felt there wasn't, and the remainder didn't know. As a group, administrators felt more positive about space allocation (72% responded there was adequate space) and teachers of students with severe handicaps were less positive (43% responded space was not adequate). Since one in three of those polled indicated there was not adequate space, there may be instances where mainstreaming is hindered by the size of the physical plant.

Another question referred to whether there were auditory/visual distractions which detracted from learning. Responses to this question were more varied and somewhat less positive. Fifty percent of the elementary teachers indicated there were distractions. Fifty-three percent of special education teachers and 52% of those dealing with students with severe handicaps reported that the environment was distracting. Teachers from schools with higher concentrations of students with handicaps reported distractions more frequently (43%) than those from low concentration schools (32%). Administrators again were the most positive group with 56% reporting no distracting environment. While the data vary it seems likely (30% to 50% of most groups reported problems), that there are settings where the school environment is such that students' learning might be affected by a distracting environment.

Most groups reported that students did not have difficulty with their special equipment, although many respondents said they did not know about this topic. About one quarter responded that there was difficulty while about 40% indicated no problem. In terms of assistance to move students with physical handicaps about one-third of the respondents felt there was adequate help, while 35% to 40% felt there was not.

Another aspect of the implementation of special education programming is transportation. No major concerns were voiced with respect to transportation. Seventy-two percent of the teachers reported no problems. Of the concerns listed the one most frequently expressed was that transportation determined what programs students attend. With respect to placement 42% of elementary but only 27% of secondary teachers felt transportation had a strong effect on placement. Transportation was rated as having a strong effect on placement by 39% of

regular education teachers and 29% of special education teachers. Administrators did not feel that transportation had much effect while 43% of support staff responded that it was a consideration. Parents saw transportation as having a greater effect than did teachers. While there is no major concern over transportation, a large percentage of parents see transportation as influential. The effects of transportation appear to be more significant at the elementary level than at the secondary level. The most significant influence of transportation appears to be on placement and programming.

While these responses suggest that the physical aspects of mainstreaming are viewed relatively positively they also point out some areas where improvements can continue to be made.

9. Perceptions of Parents

Only 24% of the parents who received the survey responded. Of those responding parents of elementary students and parents of Level V students were more strongly represented.

About 43% of the parents received information about mainstreaming. Parents of Level IV students (57%) and parents of secondary students (70%) were more likely to get information. Only one-third of the parents of Level III students received information. Most parents were given information in the last five years and most were satisfied with the information. Parents of elementary students were more satisfied (71%) with the information they received than were secondary parents (40%). Level III parents were more satisfied than Level IV or V parents. Only 26% of Level V parents rated the information good. Most parents rated their knowledge of disabilities as good. They also felt they knew of specific skills, strengths and weaknesses of students, and of special teaching. They felt they knew less about resources.

Parents also generally rated the knowledge of other groups positively. Their ratings tended to be somewhat higher than school staff ratings. However, there were distinctly lower ratings by parents of secondary students when rating administrators and support staff. The same trend was seen in parents' responses to how supportive groups are of mainstreaming. In general their responses were positive though much less so at the secondary level.

Nearly half of the parents felt there were many positive impacts of mainstreaming on regular and special education students. With respect to regular education students their responses were more favorable than were teachers. However, parents felt students progressed better academically in special education classes. This was especially true at the secondary level.

Parents were very strong in their assessment of the importance of teacher attitude. They rated it first in terms of effect upon placement, before behavioral skills or academic skills. Parents of both elementary and secondary students noted the strong effects of teacher attitude on placement, academic progress, social interaction and emotional adjustment. Level III parents did not rate teacher attitude as important as parents of students in Levels IV and V. Parents also saw availability of classes, transportation and handicapping conditions as more significant in terms of placement than did teachers. Parents of Level III students (52%) were especially strong about transportation hindering mainstream placement. Parents generally rated resistance to the Emotional/Behavioral category lower than teachers did, but they noted more resistance to the Learning Disabilities, General Learning Disabilities, Hearing Impaired and Visually Impaired categories than did teachers. Parents of secondary students also noted more resistance to students with physical handicaps.

In summary parents were fairly positive in their assessment of mainstreaming. There was a tendency toward more negative responses from parents of secondary students. Parents tend to feel there is more resistance to mainstreaming than school staff do and they seem to be more identified with categories of handicapping conditions. Parents further are very definite about their feelings about the importance of teacher attitude at both the elementary and secondary level.

10. Items Requested to Improve Mainstreaming

a. Aides

One of the most frequently requested items to assist with the implementation of mainstreaming is classroom aides.

The administrators placed classroom aides as their first priority need. Regular education teachers also rated aides as their first choice. Parents of Level IV students and parents of secondary students also felt aides should be the top priority. Aides were rated in the top four choices by all groups. Ironically, aides were not seen as either knowledgeable or supportive of mainstreaming. It would seem that classroom aides after being serviced could relieve some of the pressure of large class size which was expressed so frequently by teachers.

b. Support from Special Education Staff

There were many comments about the need for improved communication between regular and special education staffs. These comments covered topics such as eligibility standards, teachers' need for more information about students with handicaps entering mainstream classes, need for goals and expectations to be laid out, need for supervision and follow up, need for appropriate grading systems, and need for reciprocity of services from special education staff in support of regular education students.

The desire for more support from special education staff was expressed by all groups responding to the survey. Support was consistently rated as one of the top four priorities. Parents of preschool and elementary students and parents of Level III and V students ranked it as their first priority.

Throughout the survey special education staff were rated as the most knowledgeable and most supportive of mainstreaming. Regular education teachers were the least. It would seem that there must be a support system set up in order to make mainstreaming successful in regular education classes. Regular education teachers also need to feel some relief from the burden of class size and support from special education staff might be one way to do so.

Teachers appear to be asking for more communication before placement about the particular student, the mainstream class and its demands, and about a plan for programming. Teachers also seem to want assistance finding materials and individualizing curriculum. They further want ongoing support in the classroom with supervision and follow-up on student performance.

c. Adaptive and Supplemental Materials

There was very strong support for the need for adaptive and supplemental materials to improve mainstreaming. This item was ranked first or second by most direct service staff groupings. Parents and administrators did not rate it as highly. Teachers at all levels working with all types of students with handicaps rated materials as their first need. Special education teachers and support staff also ranked materials as their first priority. Regular education teachers

rated materials a close second after classroom aides. Teachers from schools with more than 10% students with handicaps also rated it first. It is not clear from the survey just what is needed, but teachers are definitely interested in materials. Among the comments were several about how students with handicaps could not keep up or were not able to handle the work in a mainstream class. Teachers possibly need alternative materials available. Staff generally reported that their knowledge of available resources was limited so they may feel at a loss as to what to do with students who are functioning below the level of their class.

d. Inservice Training

Inservice training was ranked as one of the top four items needed to support mainstreaming. It was generally not seen as high a priority as materials, aides, or support from special education staff. The only group which ranked inservice as their first priority were regular education teachers who had not had any previous inservice training.

The data indicated that less than half of the school staff received inservice. Only 47% of the elementary staff and 43% of secondary staff had training. Significantly, only 39% of teachers working with students with moderate handicaps had any inservice. Teachers in schools with fewer students with handicaps were less likely to have had inservice, as were support staff.

Most of the inservice training occurred within the last five years, though elementary teachers, teachers of students with severe handicaps, support staff, special education staff, and teachers from schools with high concentration of students with handicaps were more likely to have had inservice more than five years ago.

In addition to the fact that less than half the teachers had any inservice, the survey responses indicated that regular education teachers are poorly informed about mainstreaming, have inadequate knowledge about disabilities and are not particularly supportive of mainstreaming. These factors strongly suggest the need for inservice education, assuming it can have an impact on knowledge and attitudes. With respect to affecting the knowledge base, survey data indicated that regular education teachers who said they had had inservice were significantly higher than those with no inservice in their self ratings of knowledge of disabilities (64% versus 37%), specific skills, strengths and weaknesses of students (58% versus 31%), special methods of teaching (34% versus 21%), and of the supportive resources available (51% versus 31%). Inservice training can improve the knowledge of staff. It should be noted however that these figures still remain relatively low and are significantly lower than special education and support staff ratings.

Regular education staff who had had inservice also rated their support of mainstreaming higher than those who didn't have inservice (46% versus 30%). When asked about the impacts of mainstreaming on students, those who had had inservice were more positive. Thirty-six percent of those with inservice said there were many positive impacts on regular education students while only 24% of teachers with no inservice said there were many positive impacts. Forty-three percent of teachers with training felt there were many positive impacts on special education students compared to 25% of teachers with no inservice training.

From the above data it would appear that inservice training could have some bearing on knowledge and attitudes toward mainstreaming.

According to survey responses the groups that are least knowledgeable about mainstreaming are regular education teachers, especially secondary teachers, aides and parents. These groups should be the initial focus of inservice training.

School administrators, while knowledgeable, had a perception that they were more supportive and informed than others felt they were. They further were aware of the lack of knowledge of teachers and aides. Inservice for administrators could focus on their role as leaders for successful mainstreaming, at improving their communication and image with staff and parents, and at implementing staff development among teachers and aides.

Special education staff already are knowledgeable and supportive of mainstreaming, but they indicated weaknesses in their knowledge of supportive resources for mainstreaming. Inservice could address that area of need. Another significant area for improvement was communication between special and regular education. Inservice training for special education staff could focus on developing systems and procedures which would support regular education teachers in their mainstreaming efforts.

11. Summary of Results

The St. Paul Schools have developed a wide array of services for students with disabilities. Efforts have been made to provide a full continuum of services so that all students can be taught in the least restrictive environment appropriate to their need.

Throughout the District there is support for the concept of mainstreaming. However, the survey data presented in this report indicate that there are significant concerns with the implementation of mainstreaming programs in St. Paul.

Mainstreaming efforts are hampered in some cases by the physical environment, but more importantly by the lack of support for regular education teachers. Regular education staff bear the responsibility of mainstreaming yet they lack the knowledge and support needed for implementation. They further underestimate their impact on student's success. They are not supportive of mainstreaming because of the increased work load, and because they do not feel the academic needs of regular or special education students are adequately met in mainstream settings as they presently exist. It seems clear that teachers take their jobs seriously and that as professionals they question the success of the mainstreaming experience in its present form. Teachers indicate they support the concept of mainstreaming and see its benefits, yet they feel they need support in order to make mainstreaming viable.

Staff requested more support in the form of adaptive materials, aides support from special education staff, and inservice training.

Special problem areas identified were: 1. programming for students with emotional and behavior disorders; 2. programming at the secondary school level; 3. communication between special and regular education; 4. lack of academic achievement in mainstream classes; 5. teacher work load; 6. class size and 7. lack of ownership of mainstreaming by regular education.

The results of this survey reveal many positive aspects of mainstreaming in St. Paul, but also indicate areas for needed improvement of services so that there is appropriate education for all students.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. School District Policy Regarding Mainstreaming

On May 1, 1979 the School District adopted the Policy on Mainstreaming, titled, "Participation of Handicapped Students in School Programs (Mainstreaming)".

This study points out a number of issues that have not been resolved to insure that the spirit and the letter of the Policy are carried out. It is not only a right of students with handicaps but the responsibility of the District to insure that each student will be placed in the least restrictive environment appropriate to the needs of that student.

Every student is first a student of the regular education program and is to receive only that special education program which is needed to to insure an appropriate education.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the School Board review its present policy to determine if it covers the full intent of the law, is what the Board wishes, and is known and understood by all. To carry out this recommendation the following three actions are proposed.

- a. The District will contract a consultant to examine the issues and weaknesses highlighted by this study in order to determine what immediate and long range planning and action must take place.
- b. The District will establish a desk (an administrative position) to carry out Board Policy directives and the recommendations of this study. This desk will be a regular education position, as mainstreaming is a function of regular education.
- c. Each building will develop and submit a mainstreaming plan for approval.

B. Inservice Training

The survey indicates that fewer than half of the District's staff have participated in inservice training. Regular education staff feel poorly informed about mainstreaming and have inadequate knowledge about disabilities. All groups surveyed view inservice training as one of the priorities needed to make mainstreaming successful.

Recommendation

- a. The Board of Education will establish a calendar which includes two days of inservice training for all staff. Staff should be required to attend these during normal school hours.
- b. Inservice training will be developed for all staff to foster sensitivity and appreciation for students with handicaps and to develop effective teaching strategies for mainstreaming students. Refer to Section III D 10d.
- c. All staff will be provided ongoing opportunities to develop their expertise in effectively delivering service to students with handicaps.

C. Student Count

The survey indicates that class size and the distribution of mainstreamed students in regular education classes is an important issue. The present method of counting mainstreamed students is seen as inequitable by all groups.

Recommendation

- a. When allocating District resources all students should be counted to insure that each building will receive staff necessary to carry out their approved mainstreaming plan.
- b. Beginning with the 1985-86 school year all students will be counted in the regular education enrollment except those in self-contained programs.

- c. Beginning with 1985-86 school year students in self contained programs will be evaluated to determine what regular education activities they could be involved in, if adequate support systems were in place.

D. Mainstream Management Educational Assistant Program

Recommendation

The survey indicates that additional aides are viewed as essential for a successful mainstream program that they need to be prepared to carry out their responsibilities, and

- a. It is recommended that a Mainstream Educational Assistant Program be initiated to assist with successful mainstreaming. To insure success of the Mainstream Management Educational Assistant Program there will be a need for the educational assistants to have specific skills, training and ongoing supervision.
- b. It is recommended for the 1985-86 school year that the Board hire 30 mainstream educational assistants who receive five (5) days of inservice training prior to the start of school. The assignment of the mainstream educational assistants will be determined by the Desk on Mainstreaming and the Director of Special Education based on program needs.
- c. The supervision of the mainstream educational assistants will be the building principal's responsibility, with a teacher on special assignment responsible for the ongoing inservice training of the mainstream educational assistants.
- d. For the 1986-87 school year the number of additional mainstream educational assistants will be based on building plans for mainstreaming students including those who were in self-contained programs during the 1985-86 school year.

E. Supplemental Instructional Materials and Equipment

Teachers surveyed request materials as their highest priority to assist with mainstreaming. They also indicate a lack of knowledge of resources available. During the past five years the amount of funds which the special education office could assign to building principals to meet student needs has been significantly reduced.

Recommendation

- a. The consultant will determine the adequacy of instructional materials and equipment available for use in the education of mainstream students.
- b. The consultant will determine the degree to which materials are being used and the appropriateness of their use.
- c. Money be allocated for additional adaptive and supplemental materials based on the consultant's findings.

F. Special Education Support

The study indicates that special education staff are seen as having specific skills and knowledge of the educational needs of students with disabilities. It is vital that this expertise be shared with all personnel.

Recommendation

- a. Initiate a district-wide mainstream procedure that includes:
 - (1) entrance criteria and standards
 - (2) joint regular and special education staffing and planning to determine strengths and weaknesses, class standards, necessary adaptations, on-going monitoring, testing and grading of students.
 - (3) follow-up plans.
- b. The special education staff must develop those adaptations necessary to insure that all mainstreamed students can participate fully in the educational programs of the District.
- c. The special education staff shall continue to provide supplemental instruction but also be available for direct instruction within the regular education classrooms.

G. Appendix I

Responses to question #3:

"What present concerns do you have about the effects of mainstreaming?"
Pages 30-34 of the report are based upon these statements.

120there is still a real need to better identify those persons who need mainstreaming as a result of their progress and gain something from being in a regular classroom setting whatever that may be. what I am trying to say is that the objectives of the mainstream programs must be better determined and those objectives communicated to the classroom instructors.

123so many emotionally disturbed students are entering my school and we can't service them adequately. They are giving teachers negative views of special education and that's terrible. These severely handicapped ed students should not be in a regular high school.

124Are quality activities being provided. Are realistic expectations being set for mainstreamed students. Is the mainstreamed student lost in the regular classroom because of other demands on teacher.

126The frustration students feel when they can't keep up with others. Mainstream teachers aren't notified about the special needs certain students have.

127Regarding slbp it's the worse effects I'm concerned about. Often students are taken out of a mainstream class and given additional classes when they give up because they don't want to do the work required and or have become dependent on constant help. Also have become behavior problems.

128Mainstream teachers unprepared for mainstream. Most teachers expect the same output from all students. Mainstream classes too large not fair to expect special attention to handicapped kids when they have 4 to 6 in class plus regular kids. Many mainstream teachers resent sp ed. Many administrators unsupportive. Low level classes have disappeared.

129Too much emphasis on mainstreaming to the detriment of some children's needs.

130Sometimes the mainstreaming does not seem to be in the best interests of the student or his education. Nor does there seem to be continuous or adequate assessment of progress made or lack of it in a mainstreamed situation.

132If there is more than 1 special student in a classroom their need for attention takes up quite a bit of time. Last year I had 4.

133SLD students in upper grades have extreme difficulty in the content areas. Not enough time to provide resources for sp ed student in content subjects when mainstreamed.

134There needs to be alternative choices for disabled students when certain activities cannot be adopted to meet their special needs. Also we have little if any adaptive facilities and or equipment.

135My concerns are a question 2. According to the number of mainstreamed children how much time would be spent with them to the detriment of the other students. I am presuming a classroom of 25 plus students.

136Classes are too large. Too many special needs students in classes together. I don't have time to help them all by myself.

137Classrooms are getting too large with groups this big it is difficult to teach much less do a successful job of mainstreaming.

139I honestly don't feel that I am well enough informed to answer this questionnaire properly. I will try my best but I feel unqualified.

140When a student is in a regular classroom and he starts to fail skip classes or runs into social or behavioral problems he is transferred back to a special education class regardless of case load or how many spec ed classes he already is in.

142Time for actually monitoring the mainstreaming of students.

143The effects of mainstreaming concerns are we as teachers should be aware of all disabilities. Keep teacher informed. Students should be educated on disabilities.

144I feel special ed children become frustrated and discouraged in class. By the time they are in the 6th grade most are turned off. A need to improve communication makes large classes larger. Aides to help regular classroom teacher.

146Impact on class size. Additional time needed to work with these students.

147On staff too little time to coordinate activities share information etc. between regular and spec ed staff. On students generally good, socially for both regular and spec ed students depending on degree of handicap.

148Special ed students may find so called regular classes frustrating and in some cases threatening. It is not fair I believe to place special ed students into a classroom in which they may not excel or even adequately achieve. Depending upon what special ed category the student is in.

149Additional time not always available for staffings reports follow up individual attention. Too much pressure on already over filled classrooms.

150In our program Jefferson alt there is almost no mainstreaming outside of art and phy ed. The principal has not been too cooperative in finding alternative classes in the mainstream. Our own director is not conversant with mainstreaming either. Physical plants inappropriate. I taught mainstreaming in the St Paul mainstreaming project 1977.

151No help in the form of aides or vol help. Fair to poor supportive resources on mainstreaming of children available.

152Supportive resources should be increased to aid students who don't fit the present programs.

153The children are so trained to work one on one they cannot work alone in class on classwork. The motivational grades are counterproductive to real achievement plus the real world. The enormous resources being expended are unfair to the other children who are short facilities and services for their future growth.

155The effect on the whole class of the special students who cannot keep pace.

156With the present teacher pupil ratio how does one adequately serve the educational emotional needs of the students in a non track or tracking system. Society had best allocate resources to services it wishes to provide. CPS I'm a firm believer in the philosophical concept of mainstreaming.

157Not involved.

158The lack of time I am able to give mainstreamed students in an over crowded classroom. They may be mainstreamed but what are these students really learning.

159District personnel needs to be more informed regarding mainstreaming. Parents of spec ed kids be kept informed about progress curriculum of regular and special class. Parents aren't led to have unrealistic expectations of child.

160I want to be notified as to if they are GLO SLD or what they are. Also why should they sit in SLD classes and then all the same SLD are in my class the next yr with other kids. Why and the teachers get paid the same.

162That mainstream students be identified to me and that any special needs be told to me.

163I feel the philosophy behind mainstreaming is good but we fell short on educating classroom teachers on how to involve the special

as child in classroom activities. These activities should include improving self concept, peer relationships and social interaction skills.

165I've several reservations the effectiveness of mainstreaming. Slower kids will hold the rest of the class back.

167Many mainstreamed children are disruptive in their own classrooms and are keeping other children from learning.

168Students cannot be mainstreamed in the middle of the year all year classes kill the special ed student who comes in after half the year.

169Special ed teacher should be able to move student into classroom that they feel is best for the special ed student.

170Handicapped student being rejected by regular student. Regular teachers being forced to mainstream and resenting it and student.

171Mainstreamed students may not benefit enough from my instruction due to my lack of knowledge. Regular students would not get necessary attention.

172Regular education teachers need more inserviceing more resources at their fingertips help to see that if you make all kinds of adjustments for all kinds of students not only are you a better teacher you eliminate the problem of kids wondering why Johnny gets a different type of assignment.

173Present concern I have about the effects of mainstreaming are in the areas of mainstream teachers attitudes towards modifying the learning environment to meet the needs of the special ed students what appears to be a standard breakdown in communication between special ed staff and regular ed staff whether the mainstream setting is appropriate for the student non gradual transitions.

174I feel that many classroom teachers have negative feelings about these children they do not understand the nature of their problems nor the cause for their behaviors and they need more help in developing techniques for use in the classroom. Many teachers treat these children as unwelcome visitors.

175Students know they are not as capable as the others and often compensate with misbehavior. To modify assignments is difficult and obvious to others in the class. I'm not sure mainstreaming makes sense in all cases. Regular ed teachers have a full load already not to a class like special ed teachers.

176Finding material at students level that relates to homework work.

177Classroom acceptance of a mainstreamed child also the extra time needed to help this child.

178In general it depends upon the personality of the student and the teacher. There also appears to be a stigma attached to special education students. When they enter a mainstream class there are expectations about the student and they are often targeted as problem and not given a fair chance.

179Students are placed before they are ready.

180The classroom teacher often has a class of more than 30 students some of which are special needs students. This makes it extremely difficult for the teacher to individualize according to students needs.

182Students will not ask for the help when they need it because they will be embarrassed. Behavior or acting out will occur when they feel they cannot succeed.

184Primary concern lack of time due to class loads and requirements to be effective in helping regular classroom teachers adjust curriculum and goals for mainstreamed level III and level II students.

185Teachers feel overloaded at times.

186I think it works very well. Not only do the mainstream children get to see normal behavior and good role models but the children get to know children that are different from them in a good healthy atmosphere.

187Our classes are too large already and if students are mainstreamed to a greater extent we won't have time to give the individual needed by all the students.

189The amount of time the teacher needs to spend with mainstreamed students it takes away from the others.

190In a sense mainstreaming increases the workload for teachers. That of course depends upon the disability or degree of disability of the student.

191That mainstreamed students in my class require too much of my time.

192With increased class loads the addition of special children causes a strain. Lack of teacher training.

193Regular classroom teachers need some good in service on the why's how's and reasons for mainstreaming. They need to be better informed with the whole concept now it's that they are getting dumped on.

194When it isn't working there's got to be some way to get the student placed in a different program quicker. Are the rights of all students considered. What's best for the majority.

196I have found that a special education student generally needs more attention from the teacher. With class sizes always increasing this becomes more and more difficult and I don't want to slight the other children. Could special ed kids be rated as equivalent to one and a half or 2 of the so called normal students.

197How much individual time should a teacher spend with these mainstreamed children.

198Lack of concern cooperation of the regular ed teacher towards the children with special ed needs. The lack of accommodations that could be done in certain areas spelling reading for the special ed child is overwhelming.

199Time and personnel to follow up on students in the mainstream class or to help with adaptive materials with mainstream teachers.

200That all the necessary support services that the child needs in the mainstream remain in place. Sometimes I see a child handicapped doing very well in the mainstream so he is graduated from support and return in a year or two having failed in the mainstream with out support.

201I don't believe the administration is concerned enough about the pressures already on a regular teacher and adding mainstream students does nothing to alleviate pressures when you are handling an already to large or unruly class.

202Regular education teacher perceptions about mainstreaming. Regular education classes size too large sometimes to accommodate special children.

203There appeared to be no limit as to how many children with special needs or different kinds of problems. My judgement indicated that teacher time was skewed if more than two children were mainstreamed in any room.

207That children needing special help will be lost in the regular classroom.

208Benefits of mainstreaming for ICLD students primarily in the secondary setting. Retraining of teachers on mainstreaming of mildly

handicapped students.

209 There is not enough non academic integration of handicapped and non handicapped students. This is where I see mainstreaming. Having the greatest potential children learn social skills by interacting with socially competent peers.

211 I am not sure that mainstreaming is appropriate for all special education students. I feel that some students benefit more from more time in a special education setting.

212 Having enough time and staff to give the needed attention to special education student. Main concern is that each child is properly placed according to educational and social needs.

213 Not enough mainstreaming being done at this time. Adequate training of all staff before any more mainstreaming is done.

214 What are the goals are they achieved.

215 Juggling ESL spec ed and regular ed kids. Appropriate expectations for spec ed students. Class size. Teacher training regular ed teachers for spec ed kids. Standardized test scores.

216 Grading. Availability of different resources. Why.

217 The mainstream students require more teacher attention. Frustrated by class work. Little assistance from special ed teachers. Because of behavior problems when frustrated.

218 I feel there are too many classroom teachers that have the same expectations of all their students and do not adequately adjust the assignments to the child's needs and abilities.

219 Children demand too much individualization and take away from regular ed. No aide help. Disruption of going in and out of room several times a day.

220 Background of kids mainstreamed.

221 In service training for regular classroom teachers is needed. The cooperation of the mainstream teacher is necessary for the success of the student. I find mainstream teachers very uncooperative and find that they can find the smallest reasons for eliminating any student that has difficulty with learning or behavior.

222 Have not had opportunity to participate in mainstreaming.

223 That often these students' academic needs are ignored in the regular ed setting.

224 Although students are grouped for reading this doesn't occur frequently with math. This means that the students must attempt work considerably above their skill level. This also occurs in the areas of spelling and language arts.

225 Correlating work with special ed teacher. Work done in placement and classroom.

226 If the classroom size is large 25 plus how can you meet individual needs? What effect does the special child have on the rest of the class and vice versa. Teacher liability.

227 Mainstreaming is a great concept but hopefully the needed support staff is there for the regular classroom teacher.

228 Often the special ed children need so much attention to succeed that in meeting their needs the general achievement level of the whole group is lowered because the pace is slowed down. The teacher can only be spread so thin.

230 St. Paul does not offer a full continuum of service delivery models. A handicapped child may require a variety of service systems ranging from self contained classroom to resource room to total integration with normal peers to meet his specific social emotional needs as well as his academic needs.

231 What is the role of the special education teacher in regard to working with regular ed students? Is it possible for more students to be mainstreamed at least partially?

232 Isolation by peers and teachers in the regular classroom can be more devastating than being in a special classroom. Too many teachers, too many sets of differing expectations equals too much confusion in learning. Many mainstreamed students would be better off with more consistency and structure.

233 Regular education staff often do not have the training or desire to meet the special needs of handicapped students. More support may be required than if children were placed exclusively with a special education teacher.

234 When children with many special needs are placed in regular classrooms a heavy load is put on the classroom teacher. More adult help should be available to these reg ed teachers.

237 That I have 32 other students in the room at the same time. I have this student who needs special help.

238 Mainstreamed students unable to learn at pace of rest of class.

239 Mainstreaming deaf students is satisfactory in academic areas but does not meet social needs of deaf students.

240 Support from mainstream teachers on students' academic development. Changes in students' self outlook.

241 I feel special education personnel need to know more about the special needs involved in placing students into ind arts classes. I would like to see aides similar to interpreters used by the learning impaired used in classes where special education students are present.

242 The negative impact on rest of students.

243 My lack of knowledge.

244 I've not worked for this district very long and I'm not at all familiar with mainstreaming practices in this district. Thus I have no immediate concerns.

245 Habit patterns sometimes seem difficult to change in mainstream. Thought patterns likewise seem difficult to alter. Work habits often are lost or not learned.

246 Communication with advisor student and teacher to determine if the student can handle the work. This should be done before the student is programmed not after the student is in the class.

248 Class size prohibits giving special ed students the additional attention they require.

249 I am concerned that spec ed students in the mainstream be on equal footing as their peers in regard to accessibility to the new technologies. I am concerned that staff/parents/admin don't assume the job is done once the students are placed in mainstream. There needs to be continued involvement with various spec ed fields to assure the multihandicapped student has equal service accessibility. More peer counseling.

251 That special students do not get the quality or quantity of special services they require. That special students become the butt of jokes, teasing. That the special student is made to feel his inadequacies in an intense fast moving environment before a solid

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

d positive self image has been established.

253I feel too much time and money is being spent on special children at the expense of the regular or worse yet the gifted children.

256Adequate information to teachers, teachers attitudes.

259Generally its a positive program but it has some serious problems. Care must be taken not to mainstream for mainstreams sake. We tend to be caught in the pendulums swing. Chances are some kids have been mainstreamed when they shouldn't be and vice versa.

261Burden for regular ed not been trained to adapt for special ed kids.

262Per PI kids that aids and other students do much of what the student would do on their own in a self contained classroom. The mainstreamed student could become too dependent for daily needs such as writing and wheeling wheel chair.

263Regular ed teachers are over burdened with special ed kids.

264Lack of continuity and follow through in instruction, too many individuals responsible for too many components of each students education, therefore the programs are incohesive. Paperwork and constant accountability concerns of sp ed staff detracts from teaching. A consulting tasks reg ed staff often has an inaccurate or minimal understanding of the sp ed role, making mainstreaming less effective.

265Regular classroom teachers and special ed teachers must have a good communication system worked out. Regular ed teachers are not trained enough to often understand a childs special needs or deficits. Working with spec ed children in a reg class adds stress to the teacher.

266Can the individual cope with the mainstream classes and are some adjustments made for him. Are we sometimes too eager to mainstream an individual.

267There are many special education students who would profit from a mainstreaming experience. There are others who will regress. Those who progress should be mainstreamed testing and counseling should determine this.

268Special educ students being given watered down grades. Lack of time for regular teachers to prepare and adapt for special students.

269Exactly what to do in specific instances.

270Physical injuries that can occur.

271The mainstreamed student in a reg ed classroom should count for a minimum of 2-3 reg ed students.

272Not able to adequately meet the special childrens needs due to limitations of budget staffing and resources in regular classrooms

273Mainstreamed students usually get the short end of instruction time, they the slow learners are in competition for time in a large class.

274Childs social adjustment and self concept development. Mainstream teachers get support for special education students.

275I am concerned with the effect of mainstreaming on the regular ed students.

276We need answers to deal with the emotionally disturbed child. There are far too many children with such problems. Perhaps early detection and concentrated effort might be a partial answer. Later on swift action with definite rules might help. We are far too accepting of unacceptable.

277Not enough background on the individuals. Over concern for some hearing impaired. Lack of concern for some se asiens.

278I have strong reservations regarding the effectiveness of mainstreaming so many students.

279Too great a burden is placed on the teacher who as one person cannot be expected to provide for special needs with the large class sizes we have as well as the physical educational setting, overcrowded.

280Mainstreamed students sometimes develop negative behaviors because they are placed in an environment in which they can not compete. They become frustrated and act out to peers or teachers.

281Lack of adequate support services.

282Special students are getting left grades. I'd rather see a spec ed kid get a d if thats what they really earned. Not enough time to meet with regular ed teachers to check on spec ed kids to see how teacher student are doing.

284Time taken to help mainstreamed child can be considerable and this is time for the teacher away from regular ed children.

285That because of crowded classrooms and with varied types of disabled students combined no one person can be adequately serviced.

286Some of the regular ed teachers are not very supportive. Most of the regular teachers would rather not have a sp ed student in their room. Some teachers tend to pick on the sp ed students. Some teachers refuse to teach sp ed students reading or math. They do not want to include them in any academic tasks.

287Some mainstream students are very disruptive in their regular ed classrooms and interfere with reg ed students learning. In the more structured special ed their behavior is less a problem.

288That special needs reinforcement approaches may not be met.

289I am concerned that there are no adequate alternatives to mainstreaming for visually impaired children and I feel many of the kids are not having their needs met.

290Isolation of children, children should make periodic visits to observe normal school behavior, at least 2 visits per year. Each student should be able to use computers why isolate some from this method of instruction.

291Mainstream teachers and other students who have to put up with interruptions and attention seeking behaviors, and mainstreamed students inability to keep up with the rest of class.

292It disrupts a normal classroom climate.

293I am concerned about the number of children put into a mainstreamed class and the amount of ongoing support the teacher and the student are given.

294In this building mainstream teachers are overburdened with special ed students. There are too many special ed programs in the building for the few mainstream teachers.

295Its very difficult for the classroom teacher. It seems unjust unfair to the other students.

296Slow down children without disabilities. Great strain on classroom teacher particularly if she has children with severe behavior problems or retardation.

299That teacher are having special ed kids in the mainstream without enough knowledge of their disabilities. Also the children are p

ut into the mainstream and facing too much failure and not enough support.

300What will this do in relations to the amount and kinds of service that have been used.

301Effects on self esteem and ability to achieve in mainstreamed setting of handicapped students. Although in many areas ie social mainstreaming would probably be valuable for both handicapped and non handicapped students.

302Regular ed teachers to receive training as to how to work with special ed students in their classroom. Staff members can provide training suggestions and materials. So little time available for mainstream and staff to communicate that its hard to share ideas.

303Their needs require more of the instructors time then there is available. Also that the student may not seek help when they need it if they feel their not having their needs met by the mainstream teacher.

304That it is still not a positive experience for teachers reg ed. They need more training and supportive resources.

305The class load they place on mainstream teachers. Why does the special ed teacher have 12 students and the mainstream teachers have 30.

306Concerned about the feelings some regular ed teachers have that students are dumped on them. On other hand am concerned that some special ed feel their students are being taken away from them and given to people who don't really want them.

307It would be a tremendous burden for the teacher and reason to quit teaching. It would be a very costly program and would serve little purpose.

308Mainstreaming presents the problem of having to spend more time with students with disabilities thus taking away time spent with regular students and thus short changing. Lessons have to be geared down to these students.

309I wonder about the extra time a teacher uses to provide for a special needs student and how that time is not available for other students.

310What does special ed mean. It means many very very different things. Research lumps special ed into 1 clump.

311Upper most that given the educational problems of the students and the problems of todays students the basic classroom can't do it he disabled student just if it ever has. Can't get in a class what they need.

312Mainstreaming is definitely not for all students. Some of their behavior and actions are detrimental to a wholesome development. Some are much better off in a self contained special ed call.

313In some cases I have more special education students in my class then does the special ed teacher.

314The amount of time mainstreamed students take away from the normal students is totally out of proportion. One mainstreamed type is equal to 3 or 4 regular ed students.

315Effect on sp ed kids self image. Lack of understanding and time on part of mainstream teachers. Not enough un graded curriculum for sp ed kids to fit into the present.

316If mainstream teacher really does not want student would he set up sp ed student for failure. Enough support for mainstream teacher.

317Proper placement for interest and academic.

318In working with classroom teachers, I find that they have very limited time to plan discuss their students program with support staff, are unaware of how to access supportive resources available.

319If the student being mainstreamed will get adequate help supervision.

320If enough repetition for special ed student time takes for sp ed student to respond.

321Additional teacher work load. Poor negative behavior by mainstream child. Additional meetings input staffings parental meetings needed for special ed kids. Loss of time given to regular ed students.

322The success failure seems to depend on what the classroom teacher does with the GLD student. Teachers expect nothing from the GLD student and the student just sits there and his time is wasted. Mainstreamed kids expected to do the same work as the regular kids and fail miserably.

323Number of students in the classroom. Giving the classroom teacher too big a job with too little training and help.

324Lack of consistent guidelines in moving students from level 5 to level 4 buildings and programs. Added pressure to regular classroom programs. The rationale and the means to which mainstreaming is suppose to address.

325Can become burdensome for the regular educator if no benefits are offered in exchange. Can become a way of not offerring costly sp ed services of warehousing sp ed students in mainstream classes.

326That the expectations are not clearly defined to students countering mainstream classes from special education rooms.

327None if at all possible, these children that are able to be mainstreamed should be.

328Special ed children being lost in the shuffle. Regular ed children receiving less attention due to needs of spec ed children in class.

329Regular ed teachers who are not supportive of mainstreaming who don't understand the disabilities pressure by parents to mainstream when their children are not at that level. Staff yielding teachers have had there hands full with placement that was not appropriate.

330That children are not receiving the amount of special services and the attention they need. Classroom sizes are too large to enable the teacher to give attention.

331Lower the level the class can be taught at and slow down group advancement.

332There is a need to in service regular students about special ed students and improve behavior toward these students.

333Concerns about the attitudes of reg and spec ed teachers. A positive attitude will give positive results.

334Some teachers reluctant to mainstream children especially if the child has behavior problems. They want the children out of the classroom as much as possible.

335Inconsistency between school programs. Varies from one building to the next.

336Too large regular ed classes with 5 or 6 serious level 3 sp ed children.

337Most students can't do class work of regular students.

338Classes may too large. Not enough help not enough me to go around. The high potential students and the special needs students are being cheated. I have a lot of ideas to use but classes are too large.

339That 5 or 6 SLD children plus a mainstreamed PI child is too great of a load, what happens to the regular child.

350The positive and negative effects that mainstreaming has on the students in regular and special education.

351Materials and personnel are not available to carry out the program. This program is a farce at my school.

352Lack of disinterest of support staff to actually be supportive.

002Generally seems a good idea. Can be implemented well but often misused. Too often students are put into a mainstream class on a trial basis and must fail before they are put into self contained again. This is very hard on their self esteem.

003Effort should be made to limit the number of handicapped students in any one class and the total enrollment should be restricted.

004Whether or not mainstreamed children are best served by being mainstreamed and how fair it is or not to the rest of the class. To a many children with special needs in regular classrooms and demanding so much time. The teacher as to be cheating the rest of the class.

005There needs to be a more fluid and gradual way for level 4 and 5 students to gradually move into a mainstream setting.

007Handicapped staff doesn't seem to assess accurately what the handicapped will need to be able to do in a particular class. The handicapped person is put in a class and the students handicap will never allow success of that student in the class.

008Currently there appears to be very little communication between special education staff and other classroom teachers.

009There must be sufficient training to teachers to give them the knowledge and skills necessary to make the child's educational program successful.

010Are we truly meeting the needs of the students being mainstreamed or are we just fulfilling a requirement.

011That some of the mainstreamed students require more help and attention than the teacher whose class is regular sized can give.

014Special ed teachers should work directly in the regular ed class at least for a portion of each day. It would benefit the regular ed teacher the student and the special ed teacher. This works in many subtle ways reducing the elitism that seems to prevail.

015We are being asked to do too much in one classroom with a wide range of skills and needs. I feel some amount of ability need growing is necessary.

017Acceptance by regular teachers.

020Implications for the regular education students. How behavior affects the rights of others, how it is unfair to place a burden on the already overburdened mainstream teachers.

021Overloading of regular class with a high percentage of special education students.

022The gap between spec ed students becomes quite wide and so it can hardly be said that the spec ed students are among their peers.

It must be disheartening for them.

025Bussing them. Efficiency in curriculum schedules. Acceptance from other teachers. Time changes, flexibility in schedules. Being prepared with materials and knowledge.

026That there is not enough vocational training for special students. The special child acquires a low self image by comparison. The special child suffers taunts and teasing. Misses basic learning skills, need more time.

028Special ed people do a poor job of keeping classroom teachers informed about these students and of following up on their classroom progress.

029That children receive the proper care and training in a regular classroom with a sensitive teacher.

030They fall through the cracks, become bored, since handicapped children don't learn at the same rate as non handicapped.

031It has a noticeable effect on the quality and quantity of teacher help available to the regular students decreasing both.

033Logistics, how many is it can be.

035Additional paperwork, large class loads.

036Demands put on the mainstreamed child to move from place to place and deal with many different teachers. Sometimes cause stress and failure.

037Mainstream teachers are already overwhelmed with students being mainstreamed in their classes and due to increase class size.

038Mainstream teachers are not all equally prepared, support services vary from school to school, class sizes are increasing making it more difficult.

039Teacher attitude and expectations of students. Attitudes are sometimes very negative and can be detected by the child. Expectations are unreal.

040Regular classroom teachers lack of flexibility.

041Almost no communication regard the specific needs disability to the classroom teacher.

042In order to properly integrate and learn in the regular class the children in my room have to go to a much younger classroom much lower grade level.

043Visually impaired students don't learn compensatory at the level they need to learn them. They also have extremely poor social skills, are often isolated from other students with the same handicap.

045Too much movement for spec ed students. Student would have difficulty adjusting to this many places and teachers.

046Lack of cooperation between reg and spec ed staff, lack of acceptance and understanding of disabilities by reg ed staff, wide range of abilities and achievement for classroom teachers.

047Many teachers still have negative feelings about mainstreaming. Class size should be considered when mainstreaming students.

048Reduces quality of education. Teacher time and energy often is directed to getting special ed child to conform to rules. They do not do well working independently. They are often disruptive and need much attention.

049The implications mainstreaming has on the regular classroom teacher. Should be educated in order to facilitate the needs of these individual students.

050There is a group of children that do not qualify for spec services but are in desperate need of additional help. They fall between the cracks, there needs are as strong for lobbying for support as spec ed students.

052Whether or not all supportive services are available and that the needs of the students are being met relating to supportive services.

054Class size as related to individual help.

055Not enough help for the classroom teacher in dealing with children with emotional and behavioral problems. They need a time out a

rea supervised.

056Mainstream students can't do any of the work the rest of class is doing and with 35 kids in the class. Individual work and help is near impossible.

057Is it fair to regular students in the classroom if a mainstreamer is disruptive? The teacher must take time away from teaching to help this one child.

058Time devoted to discipline or to special instructions is a tremendous drain from the bright students. The average students suffer the most.

059Some students with very low reading abilities are lost in classes requiring much reading. Since these students have so much difficulty, special study halls resource rooms or other tutorial assistance is necessary to help them get passing grades.

060Mainstreaming for the sake of lowering special class size. Students placed there as a matter of expediency rather than a concern for the child.

061Lack of special programming services and resources for students taken from level 5 to level 4.

062That it is for the best concern for the child being mainstreamed and not for other reasons.

063Mainstreamed students take time inside and outside of classroom from other students.

064Individual attention not provided due to larger numbers.

065The special education student not be lost in the crowd, and receive adequate vocational preparation training, we've seen this fall down after being promised.

067The least restrictive alternatives, the willingness of the classroom teacher to individualize a program rather than ship a student off to a specialist.

068I teach calculus and algebra so do not have many mainstream other than phy handicapped.

069Class size too large. Lack of materials.

070Findind materials and support in trying to individualize an appropriate program. It is very difficult for me to continually find new resources for reteaching when I'm planning for 25 others.

071Large difference in the ability between many of the mainstreamed students and those of average abilities. It takes longer to present material and unless watered down somewhat many of the students do not learn much.

072I don't believe you can have it both ways if a student is mainstreamed into a regular class it should be assumed he can do the regular work.

073I think each case should be handled according to the needs of the student. I feel some should not be mainstreamed.

074Availability of mainstreaming classes to develop social skills for students too low functioning to benefit from mainstreaming for academics.

075I'm glad to have them in my classes but they seem to struggle and not accomplish very much.

076Being able to meet the needs and interests of all students in the class, class sizes too large to give more individualized instruction.

079Would like to see increased socialization between regular ed and special ed. Need classroom aides to insure successful mainstreaming so orderlies don't have to be in classroom.

080Students are being mainstreamed into areas when no chance exists for them to legitimately pass the course. The faulty assumption that by placing a sp ed teacher into a mainstream class, students will automatically be able to handle the content.

081Students placed in classes where they can't possibly do anything. Lack of communication between special ed staff and regular staff.

083Many times spec ed students are considered to be problem students by many classroom teachers.

084Teachers are not informed about the specific IEP goals for individuals mainstreamed into their classes. Students are mainstreamed into classes they cannot handle.

085In theatre arts students with real low reading skills and social skills have real troubles.

086Teacher attitude important.

087Kids that haven't been mainstreamed lack social skills that will regress.

090Large class size student teacher ratio.

091How the child is selected for mainstreaming. Can teacher have time experience willingness to adapt program.

092Not enough support available for special ed students. Regular ed classes are too large to allow teachers to make adaptation for special students.

094Children are just placed in classroom without considering what mainstreaming really means. Just being in a class is not mainstreaming.

097How to prepare the child. How to prepare children in the classroom. Assessing appropriateness of mainstreaming effectiveness.

098Students needing a lot of teacher attention or help do not get it while in a regular classroom. Are the students getting appropriate materials for their ability.

099Present concern is with those students who have behavior problems, not learning problems and the effect of misbehavior on majority of students. Definitely feel majority of students have rights to a education also.

101Unaware of disabilities and needs. Sometimes uninformed who has special needs.

104Some children require so much individual help that it takes away from the others. Many have behavior problems that disrupt the class. Poor attention spans. Difficult at times to deal with the discipline.

105Extra duties for regular teachers at a time of increasing class size. Disruption of class by emotional behavior disorder students.

106Too much time spent on these children to detriment of others. Slow down progress made.

107Puts a great burden on the teacher. Other students in class suffer from less time being devoted to them.

109Lack of training techniques and teaching strategies given to teacher. Teachers are not given enough information on students needs.

110Mainstreaming ESL students much below grade level based on language ability. Socially they're misfits. Lack of programs for special

tic children.

111Communication with classroom teacher on expectations, goals and objectives for individual students involved in some of the progra
as.

112Inability of some people to work together.

113It frustrates students who can't perform as well as others sometimes.

114No time to prepare. No reduction in the classroom load and no time to do any of the extra work involved.

116Actual time and energy available to the regular education teacher. That person has just so much to give. That can be a very heavy
load.

117Regular elementary teachers aren't accepting. My perception of it is a normal elementary experience 25-32 students and a teacher.

118Mobility of some students. Social adjustments of students being mainstreamed.

119Raises the cost of mainstream component. Raises the pupil teacher ration of mainstream component. Instructional materials are oft
en beyond the ability of mainstreamed student.